arXiv:1512.05238v1 [math.DS] 16 Dec 2015

FLOW EQUIVALENCE OF G-SFTS

MIKE BOYLE, TOKE MEIER CARLSEN, AND SØREN EILERS

Abstract. We give complete algebraic invariants for the classification of G shifts of finite type (meaning here shifts of finite type with a free shift-commuting action by a finite group G) up to G-flow equivalence.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Background 2
3. $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structures 8
4. The main results 11
5. From G-flow equivalence to positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence 14
6. The Factorization Theorem 25
7. Conclusion 35
Appendix A. Cohomology as positive equivalence 38
Appendix B. Permutation similarity as positive equivalence 40
Appendix C. Resolving extensions 42
Appendix D. G-SFTs following Adler-Kitchens-Marcus 44
References 49

1. Introduction

The shifts of finite type (SFTs) are the fundamental building blocks of symbolic dynamics. One of the various elaborations of this fundamental class is the class of G-SFTs: SFTs equipped with a continuous action by a group G which commutes with the shift. Apart from a few remarks, in this paper G-SFT means G-SFT with G finite and acting freely.

We will give an algebraic classification of these G-SFTs up to equivariant flow equivalence (G-flow equivalence). This generalizes the G-flow equivalence classification for irreducible G-SFTs in [11] and the Huang flow equivalence classification for general SFTs without group action [4, 8].

The motivations for this work include provision of algebraic invariants for the Adler-Kitchens-Marcus classification of certain factor maps

Date: December 17, 2015.

up to almost topological conjugacy [2, 1]; the appearance of G-SFTs in the study of equivariant symmetry [13, 14, 15] and variations on the Livšic theorem [22, 26]; and the investigation of a pattern of classification structures in symbolic dynamics of which these G-SFTs are one example [5, 12]; and applications to the classification of sofic shifts up to flow equivalence [7]. The sofic application uses the view of G-SFTs as presentations of group extensions of SFTs (recalled in Sec. 2.3).

Square matrices over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ (the positive cone in the integral group ring of G) present G-SFTs. When such matrices A and B present mixing G-SFTs, it follows from [11] that they are G-flow equivalent if and only if there are matrices U, V in the elementary group $\mathrm{El}(\mathbb{Z}G)$ such that $U(I - A)V = I - B$. For nonmixing G-SFTs, the $\mathrm{El}(\mathbb{Z}G)$ equivalence no longer implies G-flow equivalence. To get an analogous result (Theorem 4.1) for general G-SFTs, we consider G-SFTs presented by matrices in a special block triangular form, with entries in an ij block lying in $\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{H}_{ij}$ for some union H_{ij} of double cosets in G; and their equivalence by elementary matrices subordinate to this blocked coset structure. Using this, we classify G-SFTs up to G-flow equivalence (Theorem 4.3).

The paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2 we give a minimalistic review of background we need for the work of this paper. In Section 3 we introduce the notion of coset structures and prove Proposition 3.7 which tells us that, in order to classify G-SFTs up to G-flow equivalence, it is enough to work with square matrices over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ having a certain block form. In Section 4 we present and comment on our classification. In Section 5 we then present and prove Theorem 5.2 from which we directly get the implication (1) $\implies$ (2) in Theorem 4.3, and in Section 6 we present and prove the Factorization Theorem 6.2, which we use to prove the implication (2) $\implies$ (1) in Theorem 4.3. Section 7 contains the proof of Theorem 4.3, a result on range of invariants and a finiteness result. In Appendices A, B, and C, we establish three types of positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalences which we frequently use in the rest of the paper, and in Appendix D, we relate parts of our matrix-based setup to the geometric group actions viewpoint of Adler-Kitchens-Marcus.

2. Background

In this section we give a minimalistic review of background we need for the work of this paper, assuming some familiarity with the subject. For basic background on shifts of finite type, see [17, 18]. For a detailed presentation with proofs of the basic theory of G-SFTs and G-flow equivalence for finite G, see [11]. The basic ideas of skew product constructions are of fundamental importance in various branches of dynamics; the exposition in [11] is tailored to our topic and also includes

facts specific to it. See [9] for further developments, and a correction [9, Appendix A] to [11].

2.1. **Shifts of finite type and matrices over $\mathbb{Z}_+$.** Given an $n \times n$ square matrix A over $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, \dots\}$, let $\mathcal{G}_A$ be a graph (in this paper, graph means directed graph) with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, edge set $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_A$ and adjacency matrix A. Define X_A to be the subset of $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ realized by bi-infinite paths in $\mathcal{G}_A$. With the natural topology, X_A is a zero dimensional compact metrizable space. The homeomorphism $\sigma_A : X_A \to X_A$ given by the *shift map* σ_A, defined by $(\sigma_A(s))_i = s_{i+1}$, is the *edge SFT* defined by A. Every SFT is topologically conjugate to some edge SFT.

2.2. **Matrices over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$.** Let G be a finite group, let $\mathbb{Z}G$ be the integral group ring of G, and let $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ be the subset containing the elements $\sum_{g\in G} n_g g$ with $n_g \geq 0$ for all g. Suppose A is a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. Let $\overline{A}$ denote *the standard augmentation of* A: the matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+$ obtained by applying entrywise the standard augmentation map, $\sum_{g\in G} n_g g \mapsto \sum_g n_g$.

By an *irreducible* matrix A over $\mathbb{Z}G$ we mean a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ whose augmentation $\overline{A}$ is an irreducible matrix. An *irreducible component* of A is a maximal irreducible principal submatrix of A. A matrix A is said to be *essentially irreducible* if it has a unique irreducible component. If A is essentially irreducible, then its unique irreducible component is called the *irreducible core* of A.

An element $\sum_g n_g g$ of $\mathbb{Z}G$ is *G-positive* when $n_g > 0$ for all $g \in G$.[1] A matrix A over $\mathbb{Z}G$ is *G-positive* if every entry is G-positive, and it is *G-primitive* if its entries lie in $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ and in addition there is a positive integer n such that every entry of A^n is G-positive.

2.3. **G-SFTs.** In this paper, by a *G-SFT* we mean an SFT together with a free continuous action on its domain by a finite group G which commutes with the shift. (In general, a "G-SFT" is not restricted to free actions or finite groups.) Two G-SFTs are *G-conjugate* (isomorphic as G-SFTs) if there is a topological conjugacy between them which intertwines their G actions. For a *left G-SFT*, the G action is from the left: $gh : y \mapsto g(hy)$ (h acts first). For a *right G-SFT*, the G action is from the right: $gh : y \mapsto (yg)h$ (g acts first).

Standing Convention 2.3.1. Unless mentioned otherwise, in this paper a G-SFT is a left G-SFT (although we might sometimes repeat the declaration for clarity). This is the choice which aligns with matrix invariants (see [9, Appendix A]).

Suppose A is a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. Then A can be interpreted as the adjacency matrix of a labeled graph $\mathcal{G}_A$, where the underlying

[1] "G-positive" replaces the term "very positive" used in [11].

graph is $\mathcal{G}_{\overline{A}}$, and the label of an edge of $\mathcal{G}_{\overline{A}}$ is the corresponding element of G (so if the (s,t) entry of A is $\sum_{g\in G} n_g g$, then there is for each $g \in G$, n_g is the number of edges from s to t with label g). The labeled graph defines a *skewing function* $\tau_A : X_{\overline{A}} \to G$ which sends x to the label of x_0. The skew product construction then gives a homeomorphism $T_A : X_{\overline{A}} \times G \to X_{\overline{A}} \times G$ defined by $(x,g) \mapsto (\sigma_{\overline{A}}(x), g\tau_A(x))$, and T_A is an SFT. (We consider every map topologically conjugate to an edge SFT to be SFT.) The continuous free left G action $g : (x,g') \mapsto (x,gg')$ commutes with T_A. Together with this action, T_A is a G-SFT. Every G-SFT is isomorphic to one presented as a group extension in this way by some A over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$.

2.4. **Cohomology.** Continuous functions τ and ρ from an SFT (X,σ) into G are *cohomologous* (written $\tau \sim \rho$) if there is another continuous function ψ from X into G such that for all x in X, $\tau(x) = [\psi(x)]^{-1}\rho(x)\psi(\sigma x)$. In this equation, the product on the right is a product in the group G. This is the form appropriate for our consideration of *left* G-SFTs (for which τ skews from the right). For *right* G-SFTs we would use instead the equation $\tau(x) = [\psi(\sigma x)]\rho(x)\psi(x)^{-1}$ for all x. For nonabelian G, these coboundary equations are not equivalent. The following basic facts will be important for us.

Facts 2.4.1. [11, Proposition 2.7.1] *Suppose G is a finite group and A, B are square matrices over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) There is a topological conjugacy $\varphi\colon X_{\overline{A}} \to X_{\overline{B}}$ such that $\tau_B \sim \tau_A \circ \varphi$.
(2) The G-SFTs T_A and T_B are G-conjugate.

2.5. **Flow equivalence.** Let Y be a compact metrizable space. In this paper, a *flow* on Y is a continuous $\mathbb{R}$-action on Y with no fixed point. Two flows are *topologically conjugate*, or *conjugate*, if there is a homeomorphism intertwining their $\mathbb{R}$-actions. Two flows are *equivalent* if there is a homeomorphism between their domains taking $\mathbb{R}$-orbits to $\mathbb{R}$-orbits and preserving orientation (i.e. respecting the direction of the flow). A *cross section* to a flow $\gamma : Y \times \mathbb{R} \to Y$ is a closed subset C of Y such that the restriction of γ to $C \times \mathbb{R}$ is a surjective local homeomorphism onto Y. In that case, the *return time function* $\tau_C : C \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $\tau_C(x) = \min\{t > 0 : \gamma(x,t) \in C\}$ is well defined and continuous. The map $r_C : C \to C$ given by $r_C(x) = \gamma(x, \tau_C(x))$ is call the *return map of C*. A *section* of a flow is the return map of a cross section of the flow.

For $i = 1, 2$ suppose $S_i : X_i \to X_i$ is a homeomorphism of a compact metrizable space, and Y_i is its mapping torus with the induced suspension flow. The homeomorphisms S_1, S_2 are *flow equivalent* if they are sections to a common flow; equivalently, after a continuous time change, the flows on Y_1 and Y_2 become topologically conjugate; equivalently, there is a homeomorphism $Y_1 \to Y_2$ which on each Y_1 flow orbit

is an orientation preserving homeomorphism to a Y_2 flow orbit. A *flow equivalence* $Y_1 \to Y_2$ is such a homeomorphism.

By a *G-flow* we mean a flow together with a continuous free left G-action which commutes with the flow. A free G action commuting with a section lifts to a free G action commuting with the flow. Two G-flows are *G-conjugate* if the flows are topologically conjugate by a map which intertwines the G-actions. Two G-flows are *G-equivalent* if the flows are equivalent by a map which intertwines the G-actions (i.e., by a G-flow equivalence).

The standard theory carries over to the G setting. We call two G-homeomorphisms *G-flow equivalent* if they are conjugate to G-sections of the same G-flow. G-sections of two G-flows are G-flow equivalent if and only if the flows are G-equivalent.

2.6. **Positive equivalence.** Suppose B, B', U, V are $n \times n$ matrices over $\mathbb{Z}G$ with U, V invertible. We say $(U, V) : B \to B'$ is an *equivalence* if $UBV = B'$.

A *basic elementary matrix* is a matrix $E_{st}(x)$, which denotes a square matrix equal to the identity except for perhaps the off-diagonal st entry (so, $s \neq t$), which is equal to x. Suppose $g \in G$, $E = E_{st}(g)$ and A is a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ such that g is a summand of $A(i, j)$. Then we say that each of the equivalences

$$(E, I)\colon (I - A) \to E(I - A)\ , \qquad (E^{-1}, I)\colon E(I - A) \to (I - A)\ ,$$
$$(I, E)\colon (I - A) \to (I - A)E\ , \qquad (I, E^{-1})\colon (I - A)E \to (I - A)$$

is a *basic positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence*. Here the equivalences (E, I) and (I, E) are *forward* and the other two are *backward*. An equivalence $(U, V) : (I - A) \to (I - B)$ is a *positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence* if it is a composition of basic positive equivalences.

A basic positive equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - B)$ induces a G-flow equivalence $T_A \to T_B$. Every G-flow equivalence $T_A \to T_B$ is induced (up to isotopy, see [4, Section 6]) by a *positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence*. For a justification of this claim, we refer to [11]; for more on its place in the positive K-theory classifications for symbolic dynamics, see [5].

The elementary group $\mathrm{El}(n, \mathbb{Z}G)$ is the group of $n \times n$ matrices which are products of basic elementary matrices. A positive equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - B)$ through $n \times n$ matrices is an $\mathrm{El}(n, \mathbb{Z}G)$ equivalence, but in general, an $\mathrm{El}(n, \mathbb{Z}G)$ equivalence need not be a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence, even if $\overline{A}$ is primitive (see for instance [11, Example 4.3]). Therefore, we do not in general have that an equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - B)$ induces a G-flow equivalence $T_A \to T_B$, but we will in Theorem 6.2 show that if A and B satisfy certain conditions, and the equivalence $(U, V) : (I - A) \to (I - B)$ preserves certain structures (the poset structure and cycle components (see later in this section), and the coset

structure (see Section 3)), then it must be a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence and thus induce a G-flow equivalence $T_A \to T_B$ (see Theorem 4.3).

For the proofs in Appendices A and B, we will use the graphical viewpoint described next (this description can also be founded in [11]).

2.7. **A row cut basic positive equivalence.** Suppose $(E, I)\colon (I - A) \to (I - B)$ is a basic forward positive equivalence, $E = E_{st}(g)$. Then A and B agree except perhaps in row s, where

$$\begin{aligned} B(s,r) &= A(s,r) + gA(t,r) \qquad \text{if } r \neq t\ , \qquad \text{and} \\ B(s,t) &= A(s,t) + gA(t,t) - g\ . \end{aligned}$$

Consequently the labeled graph $\mathcal{G}_B$ associated to B is constructed from the labeled graph $\mathcal{G}_A$ as follows. An edge e from s to t with label g is deleted from $\mathcal{G}_A$. Then, for each $\mathcal{G}_A$-edge f beginning at t, an additional edge (called $[ef]$) from s to r with label gh (where h is the G-label of f and r is the terminal vertex of f) is added in to form $\mathcal{G}_B$. We refer to this type of positive equivalence as a *row cut* of the edge e.

See Figure 1 for an example of a *row cut* of an edge from s to t labeled g, with $(s,t,r) = (1,2,3)$ and $E = E_{st}(g)$ and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} p_{11} & g + p_{12} & p_{13} \\ 0 & h' & h'' \\ p_{31} & p_{32} & p_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} p_{11} & gh' + p_{12} & gh'' + p_{13} \\ 0 & h' & h'' \\ p_{31} & p_{32} & p_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

in which the p_{ij} are arbitrary elements of $\mathbb{Z}_+G$, suppressed from the figure, and row 2 has just two entries for simplicity. The change from $\mathcal{G}_A$ to $\mathcal{G}_B$ is the replacement of the dashed edge of the left graph with the dashed edges of the right graph. On the left, g, h', h'' are labels of edges e, f', f''; on the right gh', gh'' label edges named $[ef'], [ef'']$.



FIGURE 1. A row cut of an edge from s to t.




FIGURE 2. A column-cut of an edge from s to t.

The correspondence of the graphs $\mathcal{G}_A, \mathcal{G}_B$ induces a bijection of σ_A-orbits and σ_B-orbits, e.g.

$$\dots\ b\,e\,f''\,c\,e\,f'\,f'\,d\ \dots\quad\leftrightarrow\quad\dots\ b\,[ef'']\,c\,[ef']\,f'\,d\dots\quad .$$

This bijection of orbits does not arise from a bijection of points for the SFTs, but it does correspond to a G-equivariant homeomorphism of their mapping tori (after changing time by a factor of 2 over the clopen sets $\{x : x_0 = [ef]\}$, the new flow is conjugate to the old one), which lifts to a G-equivariant homeomorphism of the respective mapping tori.

2.8. **A column cut basic positive equivalence.** The other type of basic forward positive equivalence is $(I, E)\colon (I - A) \to (I - B)$, with $E = E_{st}(g)$. Then A and B agree except perhaps in column t, where

$$\begin{aligned} B(r,t) &= A(r,t) + A(r,s)g \qquad \text{if } r \neq t\ , \qquad\qquad \text{and} \\ B(s,t) &= A(s,t) + A(t,t)g - g\ . \end{aligned}$$

The labeled graph $\mathcal{G}_B$ associated to B is constructed from the labeled graph $\mathcal{G}_A$ as follows. An edge e from s to t with label g is deleted from $\mathcal{G}_A$. Then, for each $\mathcal{G}_A$-edge f ending at s, an additional edge (called $[fe]$) from r to t with label hg (where h is the G-label of f and r is the initial vertex of f) is added in to form $\mathcal{G}_B$. We refer to this type of positive equivalence as a *column cut* of the edge e. Figure 2 gives the column-cut analogue of Figure 1.

2.9. **Poset blocked matrices.** In order to handle general G-SFTs (having more than one irreducible component), as for the case $G = \{e\}$ addressed in [4, 8] we need to consider matrices with block structures corresponding to irreducible components and transitions between them. Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ is a poset (partially ordered set) with a partial order relation $\preceq$ chosen such that $i \preceq j \implies i \leq j$. We will write $i \prec j$ if $i \preceq j$ and $i \neq j$. For a vector of positive integers $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_N)$, let $n = \sum_{j=1}^{N} n_j$, and let $\mathcal{I}_i = \{(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} n_j) + 1, (\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} n_j) + 2, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^{i} n_j\}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{P}$. If $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then we let $i(s)$ be the unique integer such that $s \in \mathcal{I}_{i(s)}$. For an $n \times n$ matrix A and $i, j \in \mathcal{P}$, we let $A\{i, j\}$ denoted the submatrix of A obtained by deleting the rows corresponding to indices not belonging to $\mathcal{I}_i$ and columns corresponding to indices not belonging to $\mathcal{I}_j$. The matrix A is called an $(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{P})$-*blocked matrix* if $A\{i, j\} \neq 0 \implies i \preceq j$. We let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ denote the set of $(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{P})$-blocked matrices with entries in $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. We let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbb{Z}_+G)$ be the union over $\mathbf{n}$ of the sets $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$.

The set $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ is the set of matrices A in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(1) Each diagonal block $A\{i, i\}$ is essentially irreducible.

(2) If $i \prec j$, then there are $r > 0$, an index s corresponding to a row in the irreducible core of $A\{i,i\}$, and an index t corresponding to a column in the irreducible core of $A\{j,j\}$ such that $A^r(s,t) \neq 0$.

For $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$, i in $\mathcal{P}$ corresponds explicitly to an irreducible component of the SFT defined by $X_{\overline{A}}$, with $i \prec j$ if and only there exists an orbit in $X_{\overline{A}}$ backwardly asymptotic to component i and forwardly asymptotic to component j. If $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbb{Z}_+G)$ and $A' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbb{Z}_+G)$, then a flow equivalence $T_A \to T_B$ induces a poset isomorphism $\mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}'$. We say the flow equivalence *respects the component order* if this isomorphism is $k \mapsto k$, $1 \leq k \leq N$.

We let $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbb{Z}_+G)$ be the union over $\mathbf{n}$ of the sets $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$.

2.10. **Cycle components.** For a matrix A in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$, a *cycle component* is a component i in $\mathcal{P}$ such that the irreducible core of $\overline{A\{i,i\}}$ is a cyclic permutation matrix. The cycle components contribute significantly to technical difficulties in the classification of G-SFTs up to G-flow equivalence. For A in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$, $\mathcal{C}(A)$ denotes the set of its cycle components. For a subset $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{P}$,

$$\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G) \ := \ \{A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G) : \mathcal{C}(A) = \mathcal{C}\} \ .$$

We let $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ be the union over $\mathbf{n}$ of the sets $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$.

2.11. **Stabilizations.** A matrix A' in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}', \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ is a *stabilization* (or *0-stabilization*) of a matrix A in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ if $\mathbf{n}' \geq \mathbf{n}$ (i.e., $n'_i \geq n_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$), $A'(s,t) = A(s,t)$ where $A(s,t)$ is defined and $A'(s,t) = 0$ otherwise.

A matrix M' in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}', \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ is a *1-stabilization* of a matrix M in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ if $\mathbf{n}' \geq \mathbf{n}$, $M'(s,t) = M(s,t)$ where $M(s,t)$ is defined and $M'(s,t) = I(s,t)$ otherwise. If A' is a 0-stabilization of A, then $I - A'$ is a 1-stabilization of $I - A$. The matrix A and its 0-stabilizations define the same G-SFT, but it is $I - A$ and its 1-stabilizations which will share the algebraic invariants for G-flow equivalence.

3. $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structures

For SFTs σ_A defined by A over $\mathbb{Z}_+$, the central case is the case that A is primitive: σ_A is mixing if and only if the irreducible core of A is primitive. This is the case in which algebraic relations are most naturally tailored to meet the positivity constraints which translate to dynamical relations. For G-SFTs defined by A over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$, the analogous central case is the case that A is G-primitive: T_A is mixing if and only if the irreducible core of A is G-primitive [9, Cor. B.7]. For a general G-SFT T_A, we will need to reduce to the case that for $i \notin \mathcal{C}(A)$, the irreducible core of $A\{i,i\}$ is H_i-primitive, for some subgroup H_i of G. Then constraints on transitions between components appear which are

captured by certain double coset conditions. In this section we prepare the formal structure for this.

Below, G is the given finite group and $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ is the given finite poset given by a partial order relation $\preceq$ satisfying $i \preceq j \implies i \leq j$. Let H_i and H_j be subgroups of G. An (H_i, H_j) double coset is a nonempty set equal to $H_i g H_j$ for some g in G. For a matrix A over $\mathbb{Z}_+ G$, with τ_A the associated labeling of edges of $\mathcal{G}_A$, the *weight* of a path of edges $p = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k$ in $\mathcal{G}_A$ is defined to be $\tau_A(p) = \tau_A(p_1)\tau_A(p_2)\cdots\tau_A(p_k)$.

Definition 3.1. A $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure $\mathcal{H}$ is a function which assigns to each pair (i, j) in $\mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P}$ such that $i \preceq j$ a nonempty subset H_{ij} of G such that

$$i \preceq j \preceq k \implies H_{ij} H_{jk} \subset H_{ik} \ .$$

Consequently, H_{ii} (also denoted H_i) is a subgroup of G and for $i \prec j$ H_{ij} is a nonempty union of (H_i, H_j) double cosets.

When $\mathcal{H}$ is a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure, then we let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ be the set of matrices $A \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+ G)$ such that for $i \preceq j$, the entries of $A\{i, j\}$ belong to $\mathbb{Z} H_{ij}$.

Definition 3.2. Two $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structures $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'$ are G-cohomologous if there exist elements $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N$ in G such that

$$i \preceq j \implies H_{ij} = \gamma_i^{-1} H'_{ij} \gamma_j \ .$$

The "G" in "G-cohomologous" matters: irreducible matrices with weights group $H \subset G$ can be G-cohomologous but not H-cohomologous [11, Example 4.6]. Still, because $(G, \mathcal{P})$ is fixed, we sometimes write just "coset structure" in place of "$(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure".

Definition 3.3. Suppose $A \in \mathcal{M}^{\circ}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbb{Z}_+ G)$. Then a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure $\mathcal{H}$ for A is defined as follows.

(1) For each $i \in \mathcal{P}$, choose a vertex $v(i)$ from the irreducible core of the block $A\{i, i\}$.
(2) For $i \preceq j$, H_{ij} is the set of weights of paths from $v(i)$ to $v(j)$.

The group H_{ii} (also denoted H_i) was called a *weights group* for A_{ii} in [11]).

When G is nonabelian, different choices of vertices $v(i)$ in Definition 3.3 might produce different coset structures for A; but, all coset structures for A will be G-cohomologous. To see this, suppose v_1, v_2 are vertices in the irreducible core of $A\{i, i\}$ and γ_i is the weight of a path from v_1 to v_2. Replacing a choice $v(i) = v_2$ with the choice $v(i) = v_1$ has the effect of replacing H_i with $H'_i := \gamma_i H_i \gamma_i^{-1}$, and replacing H_{ij} with $H'_{ij} := \gamma_i H_{ij}$ when $i \prec j$. Therefore $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}'$ are G-cohomologous.

Definition 3.4. The $(G, \mathcal{P})$ *coset structure class of* A is the G-cohomology class of a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure for A.

Notice that it can happen that not every coset structure in the $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure class of a matrix A is a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure for A. If for example $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{e, g\}$, and $A = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} e & e \\ 0 & e \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, then $H_{11} = H_{12} = H_{22} = \{e\}$ is the only $(G, \{1, 2\})$ coset structure for A; but $H'_{11} = H'_{22} = \{e\}$, $H'_{12} = \{g\}$ is also in the $(G, \{1, 2\})$ coset structure class of A.

Definition 3.5. $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ is the set of matrices A in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ such that $\mathcal{H}$ is a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure for A; $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$ is the union over $\mathbf{n}$ of the sets $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, and $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ be the union over $\mathcal{C}$ of the sets $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$.

Definition 3.6. A matrix in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ satisfies Condition $\mathcal{C}_1$ (or, is $\mathcal{C}_1$) if it belongs to $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ for $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_N)$ such that the following condition holds for all $i \in \mathcal{P}$: $n_i = 1$ if and only if $i \in \mathcal{C}$.

A square matrix A over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ is *nondegenerate* if it has no zero row and no zero column. Notice that this is equivalent to the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\overline{A}}$ being nondegenerate (that is, every vertex of $\mathcal{G}_{\overline{A}}$ belongs to a bi-infinite path).

The next proposition will let us in proofs work with matrices whose noncycle diagonal blocks are H_i-primitive.

Proposition 3.7. *Let A be a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. Then there is an N, a partial order $\preceq$ on $\mathcal{P} := \{1, \ldots, N\}$ satisfying $i \preceq j \implies i \leq j$, a subset $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{P}$, a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure $\mathcal{H}$, and a nondegenerate $\mathcal{C}_1$ matrix $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$ such that T_A and T_B are G-flow equivalent. B can be produced algorithmically from A.*

Proof. Let A_1 be the maximal nondegenerate principal submatrix of A. Then $T_{A_1} = T_A$. Write $s \to t$ if there is an $r > 0$ such that $A_1^r(s, t) \neq 0$. We say that s is a transition state if it is not the case that $s \to s$. By recursively performing state out-splitting on transition states we can construct a nondegenerate matrix A_2 such that T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} are G-conjugate and such that every transition state in $\mathcal{G}_{A_2}$ has exactly one out-edge. Suppose A_2 is an $n \times n$ matrix. Let $\mathcal{I} := \{s \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : s \to s\}$ and define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\mathcal{I}$ by letting $s \sim t$ if $s \to t$ and $t \to s$. Write $[s]$ for the equivalence class that contains s, and write $[s] \preceq [t]$ if $s \to t$ (notice that this does not depend on the choice of representative of $[s]$ and $[t]$). Let N be the number of elements in $\{[s] : s \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$ and enumerate the elements $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N$ of $\{[s] : s \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$ such that $x_i \preceq x_j$ implies that $i \leq j$. Define a partial order $\preceq$ on $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ by letting $i \preceq j$ if $x_i \preceq x_j$. Then there is a permutation matrix P and an $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_N)$ such that $A_3 := PA_2P^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of cycle components for A_3 in $\mathcal{P}$. The proof of [4, Lemma A.1] easily adapts to give a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence from $I - A_3$ to a matrix $I - A_4$ such that $A_4 \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ and for every i in $\mathcal{C}$ there exists s_i in $\mathcal{I}_i$ such that the following hold.

(1) If $\{s,t\} \subset \mathcal{I}_i$ and $A_4(s,t) \neq 0$, then $(s,t) = (s_i, s_i)$.
(2) If $s \in \mathcal{I}_i$, with $A_4(s,t) \neq 0$ or $A_4(t,s) \neq 0$, then $s = s_i$.

Let A_5 be the maximal nondegenerate principal submatrix of A_4. Then A_5 belongs to $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ and satisfies $\mathcal{C}_1$, and T_A and T_{A_5} are G-flow equivalent.

For each i in $\mathcal{P}$, pick an index $v(i)$ in $\mathcal{I}_i$, and with these choices define a $(G,\mathcal{P})$ coset structure $\mathcal{H}$ for A_5 as in Definition 3.3. Next, for each $i \in \mathcal{P}$ and each index s in $\mathcal{I}_i$, choose d_s the weight of some path from $v(i)$ to s and b_s the weight of some path from s to $v(i)$. Let D be the diagonal matrix with $D(s,s) = d_s$. Define $B = DA_5D^{-1}$. There is a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence from $I - A_5$ to $I - B$ (Proposition A.1), so T_B is G-flow equivalent to T_{A_5} and therefore to T_A.

Suppose $s \in \mathcal{I}_i$ and $t \in \mathcal{I}_j$. We claim that $B(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}H_{ij}$. To prove this claim, note that b_td_t is the weight of a path from $v(j)$ to $v(j)$. Pick $k > 0$ such that $(b_td_t)^k = e$. Then $(b_td_t)^{k-1}b_t = (d_t)^{-1}$, and therefore $(d_t)^{-1}$ is the weight of a path from t to $v(j)$. Therefore $B(s,t) = d_sA_5(s,t)(d_t)^{-1}$ is the weight of a path from $v(i)$ to $v(j)$, and therefore is in H_{ij}

Because $I-A_5$ and $I-B$ are positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalent, a coset structure for B must be G-cohomologous to the coset structure $\mathcal{H}$ of A_5. By construction, a coset structure for B defined from the vertex choices $v(i)$ is contained in $\mathcal{H}$. By the G-cohomology, this containment must be equality, so $\mathcal{H}$ is a coset structure for B, and $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$. Furthermore, B is nondegenerate and satisfies Condition $\mathcal{C}_1$. □

We now give terminology for the equivalences fundamental to our results. For a positive vector $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_N)$, let $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ be the group of matrices generated by the basic elementary matrices in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$. We define an $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ *equivalence* to be an equivalence $(U,V) : (I - A) \to (I - B)$ with U, V in $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and A, B in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$.

A *basic positive* $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ *equivalence* is a basic positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence which is also an $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence. A *positive* $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ *equivalence* is defined to be a composition of basic positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalences.

An (positive) $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ *equivalence* from $I - A$ to $I - B$ is defined to be any (positive) $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U,V) : (I - A') \to (I - B')$ such that A', B' are stabilizations of A, B. It is easy to check that if there is an (positive) $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A$ to $I - B$, and an (positive) $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - B$ to $I - C$, then there is an (positive) $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A$ to $I - C$.

4. The main results

We can now state the central result of the paper. The $\mathcal{C}_1$ condition in the statement was given in Definition 3.6. Given $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N) \in$

G^N, we define $D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma \in \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ to be the diagonal matrix D such that $D(s,s) = \gamma_{i(s)}$ (i.e. for $1 \le i \le N$, the diagonal block $D\{i,i\}$ is $\gamma_i I$).

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose G is a finite group; $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ is a poset; $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}'$ are $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structures; A and B are nondegenerate $\mathcal{C}_1$ matrices in $\mathcal{M}^o_\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{M}^o_\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H}')$, respectively. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. *There is a G-flow equivalence of the G-SFTs T_A and T_B which respects the component ordering.*
2. *For some $\gamma \in G^N$, for $C = (D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma)^{-1} B D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma$ there exist $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$ stabilizations $A^{<0>}, C^{<0>}$ of A, C in $\mathcal{M}^o_\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ such that the matrices $I - A^{<0>}$ and $I - C^{<0>}$ are $\mathrm{El}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalent.*

By condition (2) of Theorem 4.1, there is an immediate corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *The $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure class is an invariant of component-order-respecting G flow equivalence.*

We will give a more complicated statement next for a flow equivalence which need not respect component order. By Proposition 3.7, G-SFTs can be presented by matrices in the form addressed by Theorem 4.1. Therefore, Theorem 4.1 (as elaborated in Theorem 4.3) gives a classification of G-SFTs up to G-flow equivalence.

If $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathcal{P}' = \{1, \dots, N\}$ are finite posets given by partial order relations $\preceq$ satisfying $i \preceq j \implies i \le j$, $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}'$ is a poset isomorphism, and $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_N)$ is a positive vector, then we denote by $\alpha^*(\mathbf{n})$ the vector $(m_1, \dots, m_N)$ with $m_i = n_{\alpha^{-1}(i)}$, and we let $Q^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha$ be the $n \times n$ matrix (where $n = \sum_{j=1}^N n_j = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i$) with entries $q_{rs} = 1$ if $r = l + \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha(i)-1} m_j$ and $s = l + \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} n_k$ for some $i \in \mathcal{P}$ and some $l \in \{1, \dots, n_i\}$, and 0 otherwise. Then $(Q^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha)^{-1} A Q^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ whenever $A \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\alpha^*(\mathbf{n}), \mathbb{Z}_+G)$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let G be a finite group, let $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathcal{P}' = \{1, \dots, N'\}$ be finite posets given by partial order relations $\preceq$ satisfying $i \preceq j \implies i \le j$, let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ be subsets of $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}'$ respectively, and let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathcal{H}' = \{H'_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathcal{P}'}$ be $(G, \mathcal{P})$ and $(G, \mathcal{P}')$ coset structures.*

Suppose $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H}')$ are $\mathcal{C}_1$ stabilizations of nondegenerate matrices. Then the following are equivalent.

1. *The G-SFTs T_A and T_B are G-flow equivalent.*
2. *There exists a poset isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}'$ such that $\alpha(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}'$, and there exists $\gamma \in G^N$ such that $H_{ij} = \gamma_i^{-1} H'_{\alpha(i)\alpha(j)} \gamma_j$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{P}$ with $i \preceq j$, and such that for the matrix*

$$C = (D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma)^{-1} (Q^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha)^{-1} B Q^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma$$

the following holds: there exist $\mathbf{m}$ *and* $\mathcal{C}_1$ *stabilizations* $A^{<0>}$, $C^{<0>}$ *in* $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ *of* A, C *such that the following holds: the matrices* $I - A^{<0>}$ *and* $I - C^{<0>}$ *are* $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ *equivalent.*

In Theorem 4.3, the implication (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) is a part of the more general result Theorem 5.2. The implication (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) is a consequence of a much stronger constructive statement, the Factorization Theorem 6.2. We therefore postpone the proof of Theorem 4.3 to Section 7.

After finite reductions, it is now clear that there is a procedure for determining G-flow equivalence of T_A and T_B (hence of G-SFTs) if there is a procedure for answering the following.

Question 4.4. Let G be a finite group. Given a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$ matrices A, C in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, does there exist a procedure to decide whether the following holds: there exists $\mathbf{m}$, and $\mathcal{C}_1$ stabilizations $A^{<0>}, C^{<0>}$ in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ of A, C, such that the matrices $I - A^{<0>}$ and $I - C^{<0>}$ are $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalent.

We will give a more algebraically phrased question next, for reference from [10]. An answer yes to Question 4.5 gives an answer yes to Question 4.4 (using $L = I - A$, $M = I - B$).

Question 4.5. Let G be a finite group. Given a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{P}$, and $\mathbf{n}$ such that $n_i = 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{C}$, and matrices L, M in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, is there a procedure to decide whether the following holds: there exist $\mathbf{m}$, with $m_i = 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{C}$, and 1-stabilizations $L^{<1>}, M^{<1>}$ of L, M in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$, such that the matrices $L^{<0>}$ and $M^{<0>}$ are $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalent.

There is an affirmative answer to Question 4.5 for many (perhaps all) G [10]. The general decision procedure in [10] is not practical. In some cases the invariants for SFTs (which we can regard as G-SFTs with $G = \{e\}$) have allowed practical computation of examples and subclasses (see e.g. [16, 8]). We note that if G is abelian, there are only finitely many G-flow equivalence classes of G-SFTs defined by matrices A for which the diagonal block determinants of $I - A$ are prescribed nonzero non zero divisors in $\mathbb{Z}G$ (Theorem 7.3).

For the case $G = \{e\}$, there is a certain complicated diagram of homomorphisms of finitely generated abelian groups (the *reduced K-web* of [8], useful for applications to Cuntz-Krieger algebras as explained in [3]) which (with regard to an appropriate notion of diagram isomorphism) is a complete invariant for the $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence. There is a decision procedure for determining whether this diagram isomorphism holds [10]. For general G, one can define a K-web invariant in the same way, using $\mathbb{Z}G$-modules and module homomorphisms in place of abelian groups and homomorphisms of abelian groups. However, this

invariant is no longer complete, because new obstructions arise to passing from diagram isomorphism to the elementary matrix equivalence. (We thank Takeshi Katsura for showing us examples of this.) Developing a complete invariant from the $\mathbb{Z}G$ K-web by characterizing the allowed diagram isomorphisms is a nontrivial but perhaps accessible problem.

We use the $\mathcal{C}_1$ condition in Theorem 4.3 to get a precise characterization in terms of matrix equivalence. To see that Theorem 4.3 would be false if the $\mathcal{C}_1$ condition were dropped, consider the following example:

$$(I - A)\,U = I - B \tag{4.6}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1-g & -e & -e & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-h \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-g & -3e & -2e & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-h \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here e is the identity in G ($e = 1$ in $\mathbb{Z}G$) and $U \in \mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$, for a coset structure $\mathcal{H}$ for A. But A and B present skewing functions on SFTs with 2 and 5 infinite orbits, respectively, so T_A and T_B are certainly not G-flow equivalent.

Also, if G is nontrivial and the cycle component index sets are allowed to contain more than one element, then (in contrast to the case $G = \{e\}$ [4, Theorem 3.3]) we do not understand when an $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence (i.e., arises from a G-flow equivalence); but requiring the $\mathcal{C}_1$ condition, we can get the sharp characterization of the Factorization Theorem 6.2.

In part because of complications arising from cycle components, in this paper we've avoided the language of infinite matrices to describe stabilizations.

5. From G-flow equivalence to positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence

We will now present and prove Theorem 5.2 from which we directly get the implication (1) $\implies$ (2) in Theorem 4.3.

First we introduce Condition $\mathcal{C}_{1+}$ which we shall use in the proof of Theorem 5.2 and also in Section 6.

Definition 5.1. Let G be a finite group, let $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ be a finite poset given by a partial order relation $\preceq$ satisfying $i \preceq j \implies i \leq j$, and let $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_N)$ be a vector of positive integers.

Given $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{P}$, a matrix M in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}G)$ satisfies Condition $\mathcal{C}_{1+}$ if for every i in $\mathcal{C}$ there exists s_i in $\mathcal{I}_i$ such that the following hold.

(1) If $\{s, t\} \subset \mathcal{I}_i$ and $M(s, t) \neq 0$, then $(s, t) = (s_i, s_i)$.
(2) If $s \in \mathcal{I}_i$, with $M(s, t) \neq 0$ or $M(t, s) \neq 0$, then $s = s_i$.

Notice that if M is a stabilization of a $\mathcal{C}_1$ matrix, then M satisfies condition $\mathcal{C}_{1+}$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let G be a finite group, let $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathcal{P}' = \{1, \dots, N'\}$ be finite posets given by partial order relations $\preceq$ satisfying $i \preceq j \implies i \leq j$, let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ be subsets of $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}'$ respectively, and let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_{ij}\}_{i,j\in\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathcal{H}' = \{H'_{ij}\}_{i,j\in\mathcal{P}'}$ be $(G, \mathcal{P})$ and $(G, \mathcal{P}')$ coset structures.*

Suppose $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H}')$ are stabilizations of nondegenerate matrices, and T_A and T_B are G-flow equivalent. Then there exist a poset isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}'$ such that $\alpha(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}'$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N) \in G^N$ (where N is the number of elements of $\mathcal{P}$) such that $H_{ij} = \gamma_i^{-1} H'_{\alpha(i)\alpha(j)} \gamma_j$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{P}$ with $i \preceq j$, and such that for the matrix

$$C = (D^{\mathbf{n}}_{\gamma})^{-1} (Q^{\mathbf{n}}_{\alpha})^{-1} B Q^{\mathbf{n}}_{\alpha} D^{\mathbf{n}}_{\gamma}$$

the following holds: there exist $\mathbf{m}$ and stabilizations $A^{<0>}, C^{<0>}$ in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ of A, C with a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U, V) : (I - A^{<0>}) \to (I - C^{<0>})$.

Moreover, if A and B satisfy Condition $\mathcal{C}_1$, then the matrices $A^{<0>}$, $C^{<0>}$ can be chosen to satisfy Condition $\mathcal{C}_1$.

Proof. The proof is a nontrivial elaboration of the proof for the case that A, B are essentially irreducible [11, Proposition 4.7].

A discrete cross section for a homeomorphism $T : X \to X$ of a compact zero dimensional metrizable space X is a clopen subset $K \subset X$ such that every point of X is mapped into K by some positive power of T. In this case, for $x \in K$ there is a smallest positive integer $\rho_K(x)$ such that $T^{\rho_K(x)}$ is in K and the return map $R_K : K \to K$ is then the map $x \to T^{\rho_K(x)}(x)$ (see for example [6] for details). If T is an SFT, then R_K is again SFT. If K is a G-invariant discrete cross section for T_A, then there is a (unique) discrete cross section C for $\sigma_{\overline{A}}$ such that $K = C \times G$ and

$$R_K((x, g)) = (R_C(x), g\tau_A(x)\tau_A(\sigma_{\overline{A}}(x)) \dots \tau_A(\sigma_{\overline{A}}^{\rho_C(x)-1}(x)))$$

for $x \in C$ and $g \in G$.

The Parry-Sullivan argument [24] shows that any flow equivalence of mapping tori of SFTs is isotopic to one which is induced by a conjugacy of return maps to discrete cross sections (again, see for example [6] for details). It follows that since T_A and T_B are G-flow equivalent, there exist G-invariant discrete cross sections K_A and K_B for T_A and T_B such that the return maps R_{K_A} and R_{K_B} are G-conjugate. Let C_A and C_B be discrete cross sections for $\sigma_{\overline{A}}$ and $\sigma_{\overline{B}}$ such that $K_A = C_A \times G$ and $K_B = C_B \times G$. Our strategy is to first construct matrices $A^{<1>}, A^{<2>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$ such that $A^{<2>}$ presents the G-SFT R_{K_A}, and such that there are positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalences from $I - A$ to $I - A^{<1>}$ and from $I - A^{<1>}$ to $I - A^{<2>}$ (this is done in Step 1 and Step 2). Similarly, we get matrices $B^{<1>}, B^{<2>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{H}')$ such that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(I - B) \to (I - B^{<1>})$

and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(I - B^{<1>}) \to (I - B^{<2>})$, and such that $T_{B^{<2>}}$ is G-conjugate to R_{K_B}. Since R_{K_A} and R_{K_B} are G-conjugate, it follows that $T_{A^{<2>}}$ and $T_{B^{<2>}}$ are G-conjugate. We use this in Step 3 to construct matrices $A^{<3>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{r}, \mathcal{H})$, $B^{<3>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathbf{r}', \mathcal{H}')$ and a poset isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}'$ such that $\alpha^*(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{r}'$ and $\alpha(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}'$, and such that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A^{<2>}$ to $I - A^{<3>}$, a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence from $I - B^{<2>}$ to $I - B^{<3>}$, and such that $\overline{A^{<3>}} = (Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}\overline{B^{<3>}}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha$ and on this common domain the matrices $A^{<3>}$ and $(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha$ define skewing functions which are cohomologous. In Step 4 we then find a vector $\gamma \in G^N$ such that $H_{ij} = \gamma_i^{-1} H'_{\alpha(i)\alpha(j)}\gamma_j$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{P}$ with $i \preceq j$, and such that there are positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalences $(I - A^{<3>}) \to (I - (D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)$ and $(I - (D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma) \to (I - C)$ where $C = (D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha)^{-1}BQ^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma$. This completes the proof of the first half of the theorem.

To show that the matrices $A^{<0>}, C^{<0>}$ can be chosen to satisfy Condition $\mathcal{C}_1$ if A and B satisfy Condition $\mathcal{C}_1$, we refine the construction of Steps 1–4 in order to obtain stabilizations $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}, \widetilde{C}^{<0>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$ of A and C and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}, \widetilde{V}) : (I - \widetilde{A}^{<0>}) \to (I - \widetilde{C}^{<0>})$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}\{i, i\}$, $\widetilde{V}\{i, i\}$ are the identity matrix. We then get $\mathcal{C}_1$ stabilizations $A^{<0>}, C^{<0>}$ in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ of A, C and with a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U, V) : (I - A^{<0>}) \to (I - C^{<0>})$ as wanted by letting $A^{<0>}$, $C^{<0>}$, U, W be principal submatrices of $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}$, $\widetilde{C}^{<0>}$, $\widetilde{U}$, $\widetilde{V}$. This is done in Steps 5–8.

Step 1: Higher block presentation. We begin by constructing a higher block presentation $A^{<1>}$ of T_A such that the discrete cross section C_A corresponds to a union of vertices in the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\overline{A^{<1>}}}$, and such that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A$ to $I - A^{<1>}$.

There is a k and a subset S of the $2k+1$-blocks of $X_{\overline{A}}$ such that $C_A = \{x \in X_{\overline{A}} : x[-k, k] \in S\}$. Let P_{2k+1} be the set of paths in $\mathcal{G}_A$ of length $2k+1$. For $p \in P_{2k+1}$, let $s(p)$ be the initial vertex of the middle edge of p. Index the elements of $P_{2k+1} = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n\}$ such that if $s(p_i) < s(p_j)$, then $i < j$. We will now construct an $n \times n$ matrix $A^{<1>}$ over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ (actually it will be a matrix over G). Let $1 \le s, t \le n$. If there exist edges e, f in $\mathcal{G}_{\overline{A}}$ such that $p_s e = f p_t$, then the (s, t) entry of $A^{<1>}$ is the label of the middle edge of p_s. If there are no edges e, f in $\mathcal{G}_{\overline{A}}$ such that $p_s e = f p_t$, then the (s, t) entry of $A^{<1>}$ is 0. It follows from Proposition C.1 that $A^{<1>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$ and that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A$ to $I - A^{<1>}$. Since A is a stabilization of a nondegenerate matrix, it follows that $A^{<1>}$ is nondegenerate.

Step 2: Discrete cross section.

In this step we produce a nondegenerate matrix $A^{<2>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$ which presents the G-SFT R_{K_A}, and explain that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A^{<1>}$ to $I - A^{<2>}$.

The matrix $A^{<2>}$ is the adjacency matrix of the labelled graph which has vertex set $\{s \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} : p_s \in S\}$ and where there for each path p in $\mathcal{G}_{A^{<1>}}$ which starts and ends in vertices s and t for which $p_s, p_t \in S$, but which otherwise go through vertices v for which $p_v \notin S$, is an edge from s to t with label equal to the weight $\tau_{A^{<1>}}(p)$ of p (so in particular, if e is an edge in $\mathcal{G}_{A^{<1>}}$ which starts and ends in vertices s and t for which $p_s, p_t \in S$, then there is an edge in $\mathcal{G}_{A^{<2>}}$ from s to t with the same label as e). We then have that $T_{A^{<2>}}$ is G-conjugate to R_{K_A}.

We will now construct a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A^{<1>}$ to $I - A^{<2>}$. This is accomplished by iterating a certain matrix move. Given a matrix M in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ and a vertex s such that $M(s, s) = 0$, the move produces a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(I - M) \to (I - M_s)$ for a related matrix M_s in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$, where M_s has row s and column s zero.

For a description of this move, let $M(r, s) = p \neq 0$, let E_r be the basic elementary matrix $E_{r,s}(p)$. Let U be the product of these E_r (so, $U(r, s) = M(r, s)$ if $r \neq s$, and in other entries $U = I$) and let M' be the matrix such that $U(I-M) = I-M'$. Then $(U, I) : (I-M) \to (I-M')$, as a composition of the equivalences (E_r, I), is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence. Column s of M' is zero. Row s of M' equals row s of M.

Next, we zero out row s of M'. Define $V(s, t) = M(s, t)$ if $s \neq t$ and $V = I$ otherwise. Let $M_{(s)}$ be the matrix such that $(I - M')V = I - M_{(s)}$. Then $(I, V) : (I - M') \to (I - M_{(s)})$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence. We have

$$M_{(s)}(r, t) = \begin{cases} M(r, t) + M(r, s)M(s, t) & \text{if } r \neq s \neq t \\ 0 & \text{if } r = s \text{ or } s = t. \end{cases}$$

The matrix $M_{(s)}$ presents a skewing function into G induced by the return map to the clopen set of points x for which the initial and terminal vertices of x_0 do not equal s.

Altogether, for $\{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus S = \{s(1), \ldots, s(k)\}$, set $M_0 = A^{<1>}$, and set $M_i = (M_{i-1})_{(s(i))}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then we have a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A^{<1>} = 1 - M_0$ to $I - M_k = I - A^{<2>}$.

Step 3: The resolving tower and matrix cohomology.

Similarly to how we constructed $A^{<1>}$ and $A^{<2>}$, we can construct nondegenerate matrices $B^{<1>}, B^{<2>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{H}')$ such that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(I - B) \to (I - B^{<1>})$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(I - B^{<1>}) \to (I - B^{<2>})$, and such that $T_{B^{<2>}}$ is G-conjugate to R_{K_B}. Since R_{K_A} and R_{K_B} are G-conjugate, it follows that $T_{A^{<2>}}$ and $T_{B^{<2>}}$ are G-conjugate. It therefore follows from Facts

2.4.1 that there is a topological conjugacy

$$\varphi : X_{\overline{A^{<2>}}} \to X_{\overline{B^{<2>}}}$$

which takes the skewing function $\tau_{A^{<2>}}$ to a function cohomologous to $\tau_{B^{<2>}}$. In this step we will construct matrices $A^{<3>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{r}, \mathcal{H})$, $B^{<3>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathbf{r}', \mathcal{H}')$ and a poset isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}'$ such that $\alpha^*(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{r}'$ and $\alpha(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}'$, and such that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A^{<2>}$ to $I - A^{<3>}$, a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence from $I - B^{<2>}$ to $I - B^{<3>}$, and such that $\overline{A^{<3>}} = (Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}\overline{B^{<3>}}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha$ and on this common domain the matrices $A^{<3>}$ and $(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha$ define skewing functions which are cohomologous.

There is a standard decomposition for the topological conjugacy φ [21] (see also [18, Theorem 7.1.2]). It follows from this that there is a matrix M over $\mathbb{Z}_+$, with one-block conjugacies (given by graph homomorphisms) $\varphi_1 : \sigma_M \to \sigma_{\overline{A^{<2>}}}$ and $\varphi_2 : \sigma_M \to \sigma_{\overline{B^{<2>}}}$ such that

(1) φ is φ_1^{-1} followed by φ_2,
(2) φ_1 is left resolving, with φ_1^{-1} a composition of conjugacies given by row splittings,
(3) φ_2 is right resolving, with φ_2^{-1} a composition of conjugacies given by column splittings.

Since φ_1^{-1} a composition of conjugacies given by row splittings, it follows that there is a $\mathbb{Z}G$-matrix $A^{<3>}$ such that φ_1^{-1} can be lifted to a G-conjugacy $\psi_A : T_{A^{<2>}} \to T_{A^{<3>}}$, also given by row splittings, and a permutation matrix P_A such that $P_A^{-1}\overline{A^{<3>}}P_A = M$ and $\psi_A((x, g)) = (\eta_{P_A}(\varphi_1^{-1}(x)), g)$ for $(x, g) \in X_{\overline{A^{<2>}}} \times G$, where $\eta_{P_A} : \sigma_M \to \sigma_{\overline{A^{<3>}}}$ is the conjugacy given by P_A. It follows from Proposition C.1 that $A^{<3>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{H})$ and that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A^{<2>}$ to $I - A^{<3>}$. Since $A^{<2>}$ is nondegenerate, so is $A^{<3>}$. Choose $\mathbf{r}$ such that $A^{<3>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{r}, \mathcal{H})$.

Similarly, there is a vector $\mathbf{r}'$, a nondegenerate $\mathbb{Z}G$-matrix $B^{<2.5>} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathbf{r}', \mathcal{H}')$, a G-conjugacy $\psi_B : T_{B^{<2>}} \to T_{B^{<2.5>}}$, a permutation matrix P_B such that $P_B^{-1}\overline{B^{<2.5>}}P_B = M$ and $\psi_B((x, g)) = (\eta_{P_B}(\varphi_2^{-1}(x)), g)$ for $(x, g) \in X_{\overline{B^{<2>}}} \times G$, where $\eta_{P_B} : \sigma_M \to \sigma_{\overline{B^{<2.5>}}}$ is the conjugacy given by P_B, and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence from $I - B^{<2>}$ to $I - B^{<2.5>}$. Let $P = P_B P_A^{-1}$. Then $\overline{A^{<3>}} = P^{-1}\overline{B^{<2.5>}}P$. It follows that there is a poset isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}'$ such that $\alpha^*(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{r}'$ and $\alpha(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}'$, and a permutation matrix $P' \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbb{Z}_+)$ such that $P = P'Q^{\mathbf{r}'}_\alpha$. Let $B^{<3>} = (P')^{-1}B^{<2.5>}P' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathbf{r}', \mathcal{H}')$. It then follows from Proposition B.1 that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{r}', \mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(I - B^{<2.5>}) \to (I - B^{<3>})$. We furthermore have that $(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{r}, \mathcal{H})$, $(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}\overline{B^{<3>}}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha = \overline{A^{<3>}}$, and $\tau_{(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha}$ and $\tau_{A^{<3>}}$ are cohomologous.

Step 4: $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ **equivalence.**

In this step we complete the proof apart from the (nontrivial) "moreover" statement. We continue with the notation of the last step.

Let ψ be the continuous function from $X_{\overline{A^{<3>}}}$ into G such that $\tau_{A^{<3>}}(x) = (\psi(x))^{-1}\tau_{(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha}(x)\psi(\sigma_{\overline{A^{<3>}}}(x))$ for all $x \in X_{\overline{A^{<3>}}}$. Then Parry's proof for [22, Lemma 9.1] (translated from his vertex SFTs to our edge SFTs) shows that if $x \in X_{\overline{A^{<3>}}}$, then $\psi(x)$ is determined by the initial vertex of the edge x_0. Because $A^{<3>}$ and $(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha$ are nondegenerate, this implies that there is a diagonal matrix D, with each diagonal element an element of G, such that

$$D^{-1}A^{<3>}D = (Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha. \tag{5.3}$$

We let M_i denote a diagonal block $M\{i,i\}$ of a $\mathcal{P}$-blocked matrix. The matrices $A_i^{<3>}$ and $((Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)_i$ are essentially irreducible and the group H_i is a weights group for $A_i^{<3>}$ and $((Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)_i$. It then follows from the proof of Theorem 4.7 of [11] that there exists $\gamma \in G^N$ such that for each i the diagonal matrix $(DD^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)_i$ has every entry in H_i. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{m}'}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{m}'}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma &= (D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(D^{-1}A^{<3>}D)D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma\\ &= (DD^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}A^{<3>}(DD^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition A.1, we have $(D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$, with a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence

$$(I - A^{<3>}) \to (I - (D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma).$$

So, $H_{ij} = \gamma_i^{-1}H'_{\alpha(i)\alpha(j)}\gamma_j$ for $i,j \in \mathcal{P}$ with $i \preceq j$, and we have positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalences

$$(I - A) \;\to\; (I - A^{<3>}) \;\to\; (I - (D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma).$$

Let $C = (D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha)^{-1}BQ^{\mathbf{n}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{n}}_\gamma$. Then $C \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ because $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}',\mathcal{H}')$, α is a poset isomorphism from $\mathcal{P}$ to $\mathcal{P}'$ such that $\alpha(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}'$ and $H_{ij} = \gamma_i^{-1}H'_{\alpha(i)\alpha(j)}\gamma_j$ for $i,j \in \mathcal{P}$ with $i \preceq j$.

It remains to show that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - C$ to $I - (D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma$. We have proved that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence from $I - B$ to $I - B^{<3>}$ given by a path

$$(I - B') \xrightarrow{(E_1,F_1)} \cdot \xrightarrow{(E_2,F_2)} \cdots \xrightarrow{(E_T,F_T)} (I - (B^{<3>})')$$

in which $B' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{m}',\mathcal{H}')$ is a stabilization of B, $(B^{<3>})' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{m}',\mathcal{H}')$ is a stabilization of $B^{<3>}$, and the E_t and F_t are basic elementary matrices in $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{m}',\mathcal{H}')$. But then $E'_t := (D^{\mathbf{p}'}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{p}'}_\alpha)^{-1}E_tQ^{\mathbf{p}'}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{p}'}_\gamma$ and $F'_t := (D^{\mathbf{p}'}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{p}'}_\alpha)^{-1}F_tQ^{\mathbf{p}'}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{p}'}_\gamma$ are basic elementary matrices in $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$, and we have a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence

$$\begin{aligned}(I - (D^{\mathbf{p}'}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{p}'}_\alpha)^{-1}B'Q^{\mathbf{p}'}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{p}'}_\gamma) &\xrightarrow{(E'_1,F'_1)} \cdot \xrightarrow{(E'_2,F'_2)}\\ &\cdots \xrightarrow{(E'_T,F'_T)} (I - (D^{\mathbf{p}'}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{p}'}_\alpha)^{-1}(B^{<3>})'Q^{\mathbf{p}'}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{p}'}_\gamma).\end{aligned}$$

Since $(D_\gamma^{\mathbf{p}'})^{-1}(Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{p}'})^{-1}B'Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{p}'}D_\gamma^{\mathbf{p}'}$ is a stabilization of C and

$$(D_\gamma^{\mathbf{p}'})^{-1}(Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{p}'})^{-1}(B^{<3>})'Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{p}'}D_\gamma^{\mathbf{p}'}$$

is a stabilization of $(D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}})^{-1}(Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{r}})^{-1}B^{<3>}Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{r}}D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}}$, this shows that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I-C$ to $I-(D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}})^{-1}(Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{r}})^{-1}B^{<3>}Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{r}}D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}}$ and thus that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I-A$ to $I-C$.

"Moreover". For the rest of the proof, we assume that A and B satisfy Condition $\mathcal{C}_1$. It remains to show that we can find stabilizations $A^{<0>}, C^{<0>} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^o(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ of A, C with a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U, V) : (I - A^{<0>}) \to (I - C^{<0>})$.

For this we refine the construction of Steps 1-4 in order to obtain stabilizations $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}, \widetilde{C}^{<0>} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^o(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{t}, \mathcal{H})$ of A and C and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{t}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}, \widetilde{V}) : (I - \widetilde{A}^{<0>}) \to (I - \widetilde{C}^{<0>})$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}\{i, i\}$, $\widetilde{V}\{i, i\}$ are the identity matrix. We then get $\mathcal{C}_1$ stabilizations $A^{<0>}, C^{<0>}$ in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^o(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ of A, C and with a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U, V) : (I - A^{<0>}) \to (I - C^{<0>})$ as wanted by letting $A^{<0>}$, $C^{<0>}$, U, W be principal submatrices of $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}$, $\widetilde{C}^{<0>}$, $\widetilde{U}$, $\widetilde{V}$.

Step 5: Getting a $\mathcal{C}_u$ equivalence $(I - A^{<0>}) \to (I - A^{<3>})$.

In this step we will show that the positive equivalence $I - A \to I - A^{<3>}$ of Steps 1-3 can be chosen such that there are stabilizations $A''', A^{<3>'''} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^o(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ of A and $A^{<3>}$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U_A, V_A) : (I - A'''') \to (I - A^{<3>''''})$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $U_A\{i, i\}$, $V_A\{i, i\}$ are unipotent upper triangular.

Recall that the positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I-A$ to $I-A^{<1>}$ is the composition of positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalences $(I - A_t) \to (I - A_{t+1})$ obtained by applying Proposition C.1. At each stage the $\mathcal{P}$ blocking of A_{t+1} is the lift of the $\mathcal{P}$ blocking of A_t. At step t, there is an index s_t such that either row s_t of A_t is split into two rows, or column s_t is split into two columns. We will choose $s_t, 1 + s_t$ to be the indices associated to the splitting (so, if an index j of A_t is greater than s, then it corresponds to index $j + 1$ of A_{t+1}). In the case that s_t is an index in a cycle component we place additional conditions as follows. If $A_t(s_t, s_t) = g \neq 0$, then we require that

$$A_{t+1}(s_t + 1, s_t + 1) = g \quad \text{and } A_{t+1}(s_t, s_t) = 0$$

in the case $A_t \to A_{t+1}$ is a column splitting, and we require

$$A_{t+1}(s_t + 1, s_t + 1) = 0 \quad \text{and } A_{t+1}(s_t, s_t) = g$$

in the case $A_t \to A_{t+1}$ is a row splitting. When A_t is upper triangular in its cycle component diagonal blocks, it follows from Proposition C.1 that A_{t+1} is as well, and that there are unipotent upper triangular matrices U_t, V_t such that $(U_t, V_t) : (I - A_t) \to (I - A_{t+1})$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence. By induction, each cycle component block of $A^{<1>}$ is upper triangular, and there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence (U_1, V_1) :

$(I - A') \to (I - A^{<1>\prime})$ where A' is a stabilization of A, $A^{<1>\prime}$ is a stabilization of $A^{<1>}$, and for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $U_1\{i,i\}$, $V_1\{i,i\}$ are unipotent upper triangular.

Next consider the restriction of the Step 2 move $M \to M_{(s)}$ to a diagonal block $M\{i,i\}$ with $i \in \mathcal{C}$. Clearly, if $M\{i,i\}$ is upper triangular, then the trimming matrices implementing the positive equivalence $(I - M) \to (I - M_s)$ are unipotent upper triangular, and $M_{(s)}\{i,i\}$ is upper triangular. Because $A^{<1>}\{i,i\}$ is upper triangular, it follows by induction that $A^{<2>}\{i,i\}$ is upper triangular and that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U_2, V_2) : (I - A^{<1>\prime\prime}) \to (I - A^{<2>\prime\prime})$ where $A^{<1>\prime\prime}$ is a stabilization of $A^{<1>}$, $A^{<2>\prime\prime}$ is a stabilization of $A^{<2>}$, and for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $U_2\{i,i\}$, $V_2\{i,i\}$ are unipotent upper triangular. By the argument for Step 1, we will likewise have that $A^{<3>}$ upper triangular in each cycle component block and that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U_3, V_3) : (I - A^{<2>\prime\prime\prime}) \to (I - A^{<3>\prime\prime\prime})$ where $A^{<2>\prime\prime\prime}$ is a stabilization of $A^{<2>}$, $A^{<3>\prime\prime\prime}$ is a stabilization of $A^{<3>}$, and for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $U_3\{i,i\}$, $V_3\{i,i\}$ are unipotent upper triangular. Putting this together we get there is a stabilization $A'''' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ of A and a stabilization $A^{<3>\prime\prime\prime\prime} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ of $A^{<3>}$ such that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U_A, V_A) : (I - A'''') \to (I - A^{<3>\prime\prime\prime\prime})$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $U_A\{i,i\}$, $V_A\{i,i\}$ are unipotent upper triangular.

By the same argument, there are stabilizations B'''', $B^{<2.5>\prime\prime\prime\prime} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}', \mathbf{s}', \mathcal{H}')$ of $B, B^{<2.5>}$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{s}', \mathcal{H}')$ equivalence

$$(U_B, V_B) : (I - B'''') \to (I - B^{<2.5>\prime\prime\prime\prime})$$

such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}'$ the matrices $U_B\{i,i\}$, $V_B\{i,i\}$ are unipotent upper triangular.

Step 6: clearing out diagonal $\mathcal{C}$ blocks in (U, V).

From Step 5 we have a stabilizations $A'''', A^{<3>\prime\prime\prime\prime} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ of $A, A^{<3>}$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U_A, V_A) : (I - A'''') \to (I - A^{<3>\prime\prime\prime\prime})$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $U_A\{i,i\}$, $V_A\{i,i\}$ are unipotent upper triangular. In this step we will show there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(I - A'''') \to (I - A'''')$ such that precomposing (U, V) with this equivalence produces an equivalence $(\widetilde{U}_A, \widetilde{V}_A) : (I - A'''') \to (I - A^{<3>\prime\prime\prime\prime})$ such that for all i in $\mathcal{C}$, the diagonal blocks $\widetilde{U}_A\{i,i\}$ and $\widetilde{V}_A\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix.

So, consider $i \in \mathcal{C}$. Restricted to the block $(I - A'''')\{i,i\} := (I - M)$, our equivalence $U_A(I - A'''')V_A = (I - A^{<3>\prime\prime\prime\prime})$ has the following block triangular form, with central block 1×1:

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_{11} & U_{12} & U_{13} \\ 0 & U_{22} & U_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & U_{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} & V_{13} \\ 0 & V_{22} & V_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & V_{33} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

The form is determined by placing the unique entry $1-g$ as the central block. Suppose $\{s,t\} \subset \mathcal{I}_i$, $s<t$, $s \neq s_i \neq t$ and E is a basic elementary matrix of size matching A'''' with $E(s,t) = \pm h$ for some h in G. (For E in $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$, h must be g^k for some k.) Then, because A satisfies condition $\mathcal{C}_1$, $(E, E^{-1}) : (I - A'''') \to (I - A'''')$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence. After precomposing (U,V) with a suitable composition of these, we may assume $U_{11} = I$, $U_{33} = I$ and $U_{13} = 0$. Our matrix equivalence now has the following form

(5.4)
$$\begin{pmatrix} I & x & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & U_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} & V_{13} \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & V_{33} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$$

which multiplies out to give

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} + x(1-g) & V_{13} + x(1-g)y \\ 0 & 1-g & (1-g)y + U_{23}V_{33} \\ 0 & 0 & V_{33} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} .$$

Consequently we can rewrite the left side of (5.4) as

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & x & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & (g-1)y \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & x(g-1) & x(g-1)y \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} .$$

This equivalence $(U,V) : (I-M) \to (I-M)$ is a composition of two equivalences, (U_1, V_1) followed by (U_2, V_2), where

$$U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I & x & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \qquad V_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I & x(g-1) & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$$
$$U_2 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & (g-1)y \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \qquad V_2 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} .$$

We will see how these equivalences are related to certain positive equivalences $(I-M) \to (I-M)$.

Consider a term $-h$ ($h \in G$) which is part of an entry of y in V_2, say the (s_i, t) entry of V. Recall $E_{s,t}(\delta)$ denotes a basic elementary matrix with off-diagonal entry δ in position (s,t). We define now $n \times n$ matrices $E_1, \ldots, E_4$. $E_1(r,t) = -M(r,s_i)h$ if $r \notin \{s_i, t\}$; in other entries, $E_1 = I$. $E_2 = E_{s_i,t}(-gh)$; $E_3 = E_{s_i,t}(-h)$; $E_4 = E_{s_i,t}(h)$. Then $E_4E_2E_1(I-M)E_3 = (I-M)$, and applying the multiplications in the order indexed gives a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence. It may be easiest to see the argument by restricting to a 4×4 principal submatrix. For this, suppose $2 = s_i, 3 = t$ and $M(1,2) \neq 0 \neq M(2,4)$. Then these principal submatrices (with names unchanged for simplicity) have the

forms

$$I-M=\begin{pmatrix}1-x & -w & 0 & -u\\ 0 & 1-g & 0 & -z\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\quad E_1=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0 & -wh & 0\\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}$$

$$E_2=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & -gh & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\quad E_3=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & -h & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}=(E_4)^{-1}\ .$$

For the $n\times n$ matrices, we have $(E_4E_2E_1,E_3)=(E_4E_{s_i,t}((g-1)h),E_{s_i,t}(-h))$.

For the case the term is h, there is similarly a positive equivalence $F_4F_3F_1(I-M)F_2=(I-M)$, in which $F_1=E_3$, $F_2=(E_3)^{-1}$, $F_3=E_2^{-1}$ and $F_4=E_1^{-1}$. In the 4×4 sample, this has the form

$$F_1=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & -h & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}=F_2^{-1}$$

$$F_3=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & gh & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\qquad F_4=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0 & wh & 0\\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}$$

Here $(F_4F_3F_1,F_2)=(F_4E_{s_i,t}((g-1)h),E_{s_i,t}(h))$.

A suitable composition of the above equivalences is an equivalence which in the $\{i,i\}$ block matches (U_1,V_1). Precomposing (U_A,V_A) with the inverse of this composition gives the required matrix $(\widetilde{U}_A,\widetilde{V}_A)$.

Similarly, there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{s}',\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}_B,\widetilde{V}_B):(I-B'''')\to(I-B^{<2.5>''''})$ such that for every $i\in\mathcal{C}'$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_B\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_B\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix.

Step 7: Cohomology.

In this step we will show that there are stabilizations $B_1^{<2.5>},B_1^{<3>}\in\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathcal{C}',\mathbf{s}_1',\mathcal{H}')$ of $B^{<2.5>}$, $B^{<3>}$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{s}_1',\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}_1',\widetilde{V}_1'):(I-B_1^{<2.5>})\to(I-B_1^{<3>})$ such that for every $i\in\mathcal{C}'$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_1'\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_1'\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix, and we will show that there are stabilizations $A_1^{<3>},M_1\in\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C},\mathbf{s}_1,\mathcal{H})$ of $A^{<3>}$, $(D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma)^{-1}(Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha)^{-1}B^{<3>}Q^{\mathbf{r}}_\alpha D^{\mathbf{r}}_\gamma$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}_1,\mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}_1,\widetilde{V}_1):(I-A_1^{<3>})\to(I-M_1)$ such that for every $i\in\mathcal{C}$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_1\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_1\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix.

Recall that $B^{<3>}=(P')^{-1}B^{<2.5>}P'$ where $P'\in\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{r}',\mathbb{Z}_+)$ is a permutation matrix. Since B satisfies condition $\mathcal{C}_1$, $(\widetilde{U}_B,\widetilde{V}_B):(I-B'''')\to(I-B^{<2.5>''''})$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{s}',\mathcal{H}')$ equivalence such that for every $i\in\mathcal{C}'$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_B\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_B\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix,

and $B^{<2.5>}$ is nondegenerate, it follows that $B^{<2.5>}$ satisfies condition $\mathcal{C}_1$, and thus that $P'\{i,i\} = 1$ for every $i \in \mathcal{C}'$. It therefore follows from Proposition B.1 that there are stabilizations $B_1^{<2.5>}$, $B_1^{<3>}$ of $B^{<2.5>}$, $B^{<3>}$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{s}_1', \mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}_1', \widetilde{V}_1') : (I - B_1^{<2.5>}) \to (I - B_1^{<3>})$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}'$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_1'\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_1'\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix.

Recall that $(DD_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}})^{-1} A^{<3>} (DD_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}}) = (D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}})^{-1} (Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{m}'})^{-1} B^{<3>} Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{m}'} D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}}$. Since A satisfies condition $\mathcal{C}_1$, $(\widetilde{U}_A, \widetilde{V}_A) : (I - A'''') \to (I - A^{<3>''''})$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_A\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_A\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix, and $A^{<3>}$ is nondegenerate, it follows that $A^{<3>}$ satisfies condition $\mathcal{C}_1$. It then follows from the proof of Theorem 4.7 of [11] that $\gamma \in G^N$ can be chosen such that for each $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the diagonal matrix $(DD_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}})_i$ is 1. Applying Proposition A.1, we get stabilizations $A_1^{<3>}$, M_1 of $A^{<3>}$, $(D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}})^{-1} (Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{r}})^{-1} B^{<3>} Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{r}} D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}}$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}_1, \widetilde{V}_1) : (I - A_1^{<3>}) \to (I - M_1)$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_1\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_1\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix.

Step 8: Conclusion.

By composing the equivalences $(\widetilde{U}_B, \widetilde{V}_B) : (I - B'''') \to (I - B^{<2.5>''''})$ and $(\widetilde{U}_1', \widetilde{V}_1') : (I - B_1^{<2.5>}) \to (I - B_1^{<3>})$, we get stabilizations $B_2, B_2^{<3>} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}'}^o(\mathcal{C}', \mathbf{s}_2', \mathcal{H}')$ of B, $B^{<3>}$ and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}'}(\mathbf{s}_2', \mathcal{H}')$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}_2', \widetilde{V}_2') : (I - B_2) \to (I - B_2^{<3>})$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}'$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_2'\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_2'\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix. By multiplying this equivalence with $(D_\gamma^{\mathbf{s}_2'})^{-1} (Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{s}_2'})^{-1}$ on the left and $Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{s}_2'} D_\gamma^{\mathbf{s}_2'}$ on the right we get stabilizations $C_2, M_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^o(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{s}_2, \mathcal{H})$ of C, $(D_\gamma^{\mathbf{s}_2})^{-1} (Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{s}_2})^{-1} B^{<3>} Q_\alpha^{\mathbf{s}_2} D_\gamma^{\mathbf{r}}$ (where $\alpha^*(\mathbf{s}_2) = \mathbf{s}_2'$) and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}_2, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}_2, \widetilde{V}_2) : (I - C_2) \to (I - M_2)$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}_2\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}_2\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix. By composing the inverse of this equivalence with the equivalences $(\widetilde{U}_A, \widetilde{V}_A) : (I - A'''') \to (I - A^{<3>''''})$ and $(\widetilde{U}_1, \widetilde{V}_1) : (I - A_1^{<3>}) \to (I - M_1)$, we get stabilizations $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}, \widetilde{C}^{<0>} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^o(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{t}, \mathcal{H})$ of A, C and a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{s}_3, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(\widetilde{U}, \widetilde{V}) : (I - \widetilde{A}^{<0>}) \to (I - \widetilde{C}^{<0>})$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$ the matrices $\widetilde{U}\{i,i\}$, $\widetilde{V}\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix.

It remains to obtain the equivalence in $\mathcal{C}_1$ form. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the index set of $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}$ (and $\widetilde{C}^{<0>}$), and let $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{sec}}$ be the set of elements $s \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $i(s) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}(s,t) = \widetilde{A}^{<0>}(t,s) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$. Since $\widetilde{U}(I - \widetilde{A}^{<0>})\widetilde{V} = I - \widetilde{C}^{<0>}$, $\widetilde{U}\{i,i\}$ and $\widetilde{V}\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix for every $i \in \mathcal{C}$, and $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}$ and $\widetilde{C}^{<0>}$ satisfy condition $\mathcal{C}_{1+}$ (because A and C satisfy condition $\mathcal{C}_1$), it follows that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{sec}}$ is equal to the set of $s \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $i(s) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\widetilde{C}^{<0>}(s,t) = \widetilde{C}^{<0>}(t,s) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{prim}}$ be the complement in $\mathcal{I}$ of the $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{sec}}$. Let $\widetilde{W} = \widetilde{V}^{-1}$ and write

the equivalence in the form

$$\widetilde{U}(I - \widetilde{A}^{<0>}) = (I - \widetilde{C}^{<0>})\widetilde{W}. \tag{5.5}$$

Let $A^{<0>}$, $C^{<0>}$, U, W be the principal submatrices of $\widetilde{A}^{<0>}$, $\widetilde{C}^{<0>}$, $\widetilde{U}$, $\widetilde{V}$ with index set $\mathcal{I}_{\text{prim}}$. Then $A^{<0>}, C^{<0>}$ are $\mathcal{C}_1$ stabilizations in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ of A, C. If we can show $U(I - A^{<0>}) = (I - C^{<0>})W$, then we have the required $\mathcal{C}_1$ equivalence. For a verification, suppose $t, u \in I_{\text{prim}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(U(I - A^{<0>})\big)(t,u) &= U(t,u) - (UA^{<0>})(t,u) \\
&= U(t,u) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{prim}}} U(t,s)A^{<0>}(s,u) \\
&= \widetilde{U}(t,u) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{prim}}} \widetilde{U}(t,s)\widetilde{A}^{<0>}(s,u) \\
&= \widetilde{U}(t,u) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{I}} \widetilde{U}(t,s)\widetilde{A}^{<0>}(s,u) \\
&= \big(\widetilde{U}(I - \widetilde{A}^{<0>})\big)(t,u).
\end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\Big((I - C^{<0>})W\Big)(t,u) = \Big((I - \widetilde{C}^{<0>})\widetilde{W}\Big)(t,u).$$

The required equality now follows from (5.5).

□

6. The Factorization Theorem

In this section we present and prove the Factorization Theorem 6.2 which we shall use to prove the implication (2) $\implies$ (1) in Theorem 4.3.

As before, G is a finite group, $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ is a finite poset given by a partial order relation $\preceq$ satisfying $i \preceq j \implies i \leq j$, $\mathcal{C}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{P}$, and $\mathcal{H} = \{H_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathcal{P}}$ is a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure.

Definition 6.1. A matrix A in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ satisfies condition $\mathcal{C}_2$ if the following holds: if $i \in \mathcal{P}$ and i is not a cycle component of A, then there are matrices U_i, V_i in $\mathrm{El}(n_i, H_i)$ such that $U_i(I - A_i)V_i$ is a block diagonal matrix with one summand a 2×2 identity matrix.

Theorem 6.2 (Factorization Theorem)**.** *Suppose A and A' are matrices in $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, which satisfy conditions $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) $(U, V) : (I - A) \to (I - A')$ is an $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence.
(2) $(U, V) : (I - A) \to (I - A')$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence.

We do not have a sharp statement as to which general $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalences are positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalences. However, the restriction above

to matrices satisfying $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ is rather mild. Condition $\mathcal{C}_2$ is a harmless technical condition (achievable by replacing A with a larger stabilization) which is needed below to apply the Factorization Theorem proved in [11] for the case that the presenting matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ is essentially irreducible. Any G-SFT can be presented by a matrix in some $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ which satisfies $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$.

The rest of the section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 6.2. We will first introduce some additional notation and present and prove some lemmas and a proposition which we will need for the proof of Theorem 6.2. We shall use and generalize techniques from [11] and [4].

Definition 6.3. Given $\mathcal{H}$ and $i \prec j$, $\mathcal{D}_{ij} = \mathcal{D}_{ij}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of (H_i, H_j) double cosets contained in H_{ij}, and $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \mathcal{R}_{ij}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of $D \in \mathcal{D}_{ij}$ such that

$$i \prec k \prec j \implies H_{ik}H_{kj} \cap D = \emptyset \ . \tag{6.4}$$

We also define

$$\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{C}} = \{(i, j, D) : D \in \mathcal{R}_{ij}, i \in \mathcal{C} \text{ or } j \in \mathcal{C}\} \ . \tag{6.5}$$

Roughly speaking, $\mathcal{R}_{ij}$ captures those double cosets from i to j which cannot be extended via an intermediate vertex k. As we shall see, this case requires careful attention.

It will be convenient to work with "more positive" matrices; for this we develop additional definitions. If D is a nonempty subset of G, then π_D is the projection

$$\pi_D : \sum_{g \in G} n_g g \mapsto \sum_{g \in D} n_g g \ .$$

An element $\sum_{g \in G} n_g g$ is D-positive if $n_g \geq 0$ for any g and $n_g > 0$ precisely when $g \in D$. The terms are used for matrices when the conditions hold entrywise.

Definition 6.6. $\mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ is the set of matrices M in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ whose blocks $M\{i, j\}$ satisfy the following conditions:

(1) $M\{i, i\}$ has the form $(g_i - 1)$ for some $g_i \in G$ if $i \in \mathcal{C}$.
(2) $M\{i, i\}$ is H_i-positive if $i \notin \mathcal{C}$.
(3) If $i \prec j$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}_{ij}$, then
 (*i*) $(i, j, D) \notin \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{C}} \implies \pi_D M\{i, j\}$ is D-positive
 (*ii*) $(i, j, D) \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{C}} \implies \pi_D M\{i, j\} > 0$.

By definition, the condition $\pi_D M\{i, j\} > 0$ means that every entry of $\pi_D M\{i, j\}$ is nonnegative and nonzero.

Definitions 6.7. An elementary positive equivalence in $\mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ is an $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U, V) \colon B \to B' = UBV$ such that the following hold:

(1) $B, B' \in \mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$;

(2) one of U, V equals I;
(3) one of U, V is a basic elementary matrix.

A positive equivalence in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ is a composition of elementary positive equivalences in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$. For such an equivalence, we use notations such as

$$(U,V)\colon B \xrightarrow[+]{} B' \quad \text{or} \quad B \xrightarrow[+]{(U,V)} B' \quad \text{or} \quad B \xrightarrow[+]{} B' .$$

Observation 6.8. *Suppose A, A' are in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{o}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$; $B = A - I$, $B' = A' - I$; and*

$$(U,V)\colon B \xrightarrow[+]{} B' .$$

Then $(U,V)\colon I - A \to I - A'$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence.

Before addressing the proof of Theorem 6.2 we introduce further notation. $\kappa(g)$ denotes the order of g in G.

Definition 6.9. We define

$$\delta_{ij} = \sum_{g \in H_{ij}} g \qquad \text{if } i \prec j$$

$$\delta_i = \begin{cases} \sum_{m=0}^{\kappa(g_i)-1} (g_i)^m & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{C} \\ 1 & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{C} \end{cases}$$

Definition 6.10. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(i,j) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P} : i \prec j\}$. Define $\mathcal{S}_0 = \emptyset$. Inductively, given $\mathcal{S}_m$, define $\mathcal{S}_{m+1}$ to be the set of (i,j) in $\mathcal{S}$ such that

$$i \prec k \prec j \implies \{(i,k),(k,j)\} \subset \cup_{k=0}^{m} \mathcal{S}_k .$$

Define $\rho(i,j) = m$ if $(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}_m$.

Proposition 6.11. *If $A \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{o}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, then there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A$ to $I - A'$, where $A' - I \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and A' satisfies $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$.*

Proof. For the case A is essentially irreducible, this is [11, Lemma 6.6]; for the case $G = \{e\}$, it is [4, Appendix A]. We will just sketch the argument for our case, by appeal to those proofs.

Condition $\mathcal{C}_2$ is satisfied by passing from A to a stabilization A_1 with blocking vector $\mathbf{m}$ where $m_i = n_i + 2$ if $i \notin \mathcal{C}$. The proof of [4, Lemma A.1] easily adapts to give a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A_1$ to a matrix $I - A_2$ such that A_2 satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_{1+}$ of Definition 5.1. But this means that $I - A_1$ is $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalent to the matrix $I - A_3$, where A_3 is obtained from A_2 by removing all zero rows and columns through cycle component indices; this A_3 satisfies $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$.

Now, given $i \notin \mathcal{C}$, the proof of [11, Lemma 6.6] adapts to give a $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence to a matrix whose ith diagonal block is H_i-positive. (The variation is that the "trim" Step 2 is applied when a row or column of the diagonal block A_i is zero, and entries in those rows and columns everywhere in A are trimmed to zero also outside

this block.) Applying this to each $i \notin \mathcal{C}$, we get a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I-A$ to a matrix $I-A_4$ such that $B = A_4 - I$ satisfies all conditions of Definition 6.6 except perhaps condition (3). Note in particular that every cycle component, allowing exactly one loop, must have the form stipulated in Condition 6.6(1).

To arrange for condition (3), consider a double coset $D \in \mathcal{D}_{ij}$. If $i \notin \mathcal{C}$ or $j \notin \mathcal{C}$ it is easy to arrange using Condition 6.6(2) that $\pi_D B\{i,j\}$ is D-positive after adding suitable rows or columns. Thus, for the remainder of the discussion we may assume that $i, j \in \mathcal{C}$.

If $(i,j,D) \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$ we have that $D \in \mathcal{R}_{ij}$ and thus the single entry in $\pi_D B\{i,j\}$ cannot vanish. Indeed if it did, then no element of D could label a path from component i to component j, and $D \cap H_{ij} = \emptyset$. Thus B automatically satisfies the condition 6.6(3)(ii).

We note that this is the only possible case when $\rho(i,j) = 1$ (cf. Definition 6.10), so that we may proceed by arranging condition (3) at increasing values of ρ and hence may assume that this has already been obtained when $\rho(i',j') < \rho(i,j)$.

When $(i,j,D) \notin \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$, in general one must construct a nontrivial positive equivalence to achieve Condition 6.6(3)(i). We have that $D \notin \mathcal{R}_{ij}$ so there is k such that $i \prec k \prec j$ and $D \cap H_{ik}H_{kj} \neq \emptyset$, and so $D \subseteq H_{ik}H_{kj}$.

To do so, assume first that $k \in \mathcal{C}$. Looking only at the blocks corresponding to $\{i,j,k\}$, all of which are 1×1, we note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1-g_i & -b & -c \\ 0 & 1-g_k & -d \\ 0 & 0 & 1-g_j \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-g_i & -bg_k & -c-bd \\ 0 & 1-g_k & -d \\ 0 & 0 & 1-g_j \end{pmatrix}$$

Iterating the first move, we can for any $\ell > 0$ add $-b(1+g_k+\cdots+g_k^{\ell})d$ to the $\{i,j\}$ block of $-B$. Then we can use that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & c \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1-g_i & -b & -c \\ 0 & 1-g_k & -d \\ 0 & 0 & 1-g_j \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-g_i & -b & -g_ic \\ 0 & 1-g_k & -d \\ 0 & 0 & 1-g_j \end{pmatrix}$$

to replace the $\{i,j\}$ block of $-B$ by $-g_i(c+b(1+g_k+\cdots+g_k^{\ell})d)$, and repeat the first iterated move to arrive at

$$-g_ic - (1+g_i)b(1+g_k+\cdots+g_k^{\ell})d$$

in the $\{i,j\}$ block. Repeating this all the way to $\kappa(g_i)$, and doing the same from the right, we see that we can increase the $\{i,j\}$ block of B by (at least) $\sum_g g$, with the sum over $g \in H_iH_{ik}H_kH_{kj}H_j = H_{ik}H_{kj}$, since we know by our assumption that condition (3) holds at $\{i,k\}$ and $\{k,j\}$ (indeed, $\rho(i,k), \rho(k,j) < \rho(i,j)$) that b and d have at least one nonzero entry at each double coset of H_{ik} and H_{jk}, respectively. Thus we can arrange that the coefficient of any $g \in D$ is positive.

When $k \notin \mathcal{C}$ we argue the same way using any index corresponding to a row and column in block $\{k\}$. □

Let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ be the set of matrices M in $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ such that every diagonal block $M\{i,i\}$ is the identity matrix. We now address equivalences (U,V) for matrices U, V in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$.

In Lemma 6.13, we will consider 2×2 upper triangular matrices. Formally, let $\mathcal{P}_{1,2} = \{1,2\}$ with $1 \prec 2$.

Definition 6.12. Suppose $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2)$; $\mathcal{H}$ is a $(G, \mathcal{P}_{1,2})$ coset structure; and B, B' are in $\mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}_{1,2}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$. A string of basic elementary positive $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}_{1,2}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalences

$$B \xrightarrow[+]{(E_1,F_1)} \xrightarrow[+]{(E_2,F_2)} \cdots \xrightarrow[+]{(E_t,F_t)} B'$$

is *extendable* if the matrix products $E_1 \cdots E_i$ and $F_i \cdots F_1$ are nonnegative, $1 \le i \le t$. In this case, with $(U,V) = (E_t \cdots E_2 E_1, F_1 F_2 \cdots F_t)$, we also say that $(U,V) : B \to C$ is an *extendable* positive equivalence.

Our interest in extendable equivalences is the following. Suppose M, M' are in $\mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ with 2×2 principal submatrices B, B' on the same coordinate indices s, t contained in a block $\{i,j\}$ with $i \prec j$. Then an extendable positive equivalence of B, B' (with respect to the restriction of $\mathcal{H}$) will give (by the same elementary operations) a positive equivalence from M to M' in $\mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$.

Lemma 6.13. *Suppose $(U,V) : B \to B'$ is a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence which only differs from the identity at blocks $U\{i,j\}$ and $V\{i,j\}$, and that every entry of $U\{i,j\}$ and $V\{i,j\}$ lies in $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. Then $(U,V) : B \to B'$ is an extendable positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence, and consequently*

$$(U,V)\colon B \xrightarrow[+]{} B'$$

Proof.
Case 1 $i, j \notin \mathcal{C}$**:**
Since B, B' have positive entries in all relevant diagonal blocks we can simply decompose U and V one entry at a time, thus obtaining an extendable positive H_{ij}-equivalence at every step.
Case 2 $i, j \in \mathcal{C}$**:**
Note first that in this case, the nontrivial matrices $U\{i,j\}$ and $V\{i,j\}$ are 1×1. Let p be the entry of $U\{i,j\}$ and s the entry of $V\{i,j\}$; we have assumed that $p, s \in \mathbb{Z}_+G$.

The proof is by induction on $K = \overline{p+s}$, and the lemma is true for $K = 0$. Suppose $\overline{p+s} = K > 0$ and the lemma holds if $\overline{p+s} < K$.

Here the submatrix of the equivalence $UBV = B'$ containing any change has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & p \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g-1 & r \\ 0 & h-1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g-1 & r' \\ 0 & h-1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{6.14}$$

where

$$r' = r + p(h-1) + (g-1)s \tag{6.15}$$

We use $E(x)$ to denote a matrix $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$; e.g., $U = E(p)$. For any x, y, z,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g-1 & y \\ 0 & h-1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & z \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g-1 & y + x(h-1) + (g-1)z \\ 0 & h-1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{6.16}$$

so here the pair $(E(x), E(z))$ acts by adding $x(h-1) + (g-1)z$ to the $(1,2)$ entry. The equivalence given by (U, V) is a composition of basic elementary equivalences, given by $(I, E(w))$ or $(E(w), I)$, with $w \in G$ a summand of p or s. Such an equivalence acts by adding a term $w' - w$ to the $1, 2$ position, where w' is wh or gw.

Case 2(i):

Assume $r \neq r'$. Let $r = \sum_w n_w w$ and $r' = \sum_w n'_w w$. The images $\overline{r}$ and $\overline{r'}$ under the augmentation must be equal. So, there must be some $w \in G$ such that $n_w > n'_w$. Therefore w must be a summand of p or s, and $(I, E(w))$ or $(E(w), I)$ applied to B is a positive equivalence in $\mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$. Now the equivalence given by (U, V) is this positive equivalence followed by one satisfying the induction hypothesis. A composition of extendable equivalences is extendable. This completes the inductive step if $r \neq r'$.

Case 2(ii):

Assume $r = r'$ and note that in this case

$$p + s = ph + gs \tag{6.17}$$

according to (6.15).

Suppose w_0 is a summand of $p + s$. Then $w_0 \in H_{12}$, since $(U, V) : B \to B'$ is a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence. Because $B \in \mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, there must be a summand x of r and i, j such that $w_0 = g^i x h^j$. We then have a positive equivalence $(E, F) : B \to B_0$ defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} g-1 & r \\ 0 & h-1 \end{pmatrix} \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(I,E(x))}} \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(I,E(gx))}} \cdots \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(I,E(g^{i-1}x))}}$$
$$\underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(E(g^i x),I)}} \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(E(g^i xh),I)}} \cdots \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(E(g^i xh^{j-1}),I)}} \begin{pmatrix} g-1 & r + g^i x h^j - x \\ 0 & h-1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Let (E_t, F_t) be the tth of these basic positive equivalences, so, $(E, F) = (E_{i+j} \cdots E_1, F_1 \cdots F_{i+j})$. Define

$$(E'_1, F'_1) = \begin{cases} (E(w_0), I) & \text{if } w_0 \text{ is a summand of } p \\ (I, E(w_0)) & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Now $(E'_1, F'_1) : B_0 \underset{+}{\to} E'_1 B_0 F'_1 =: B_1$, with $B_1(1,2) = B_0(1,2) + w_1 - w_0$, where $w_1 = w_0 h$ if $E'_1 = E(w)$ and $w_1 = g w_0$ if $F'_1 = E(w)$. In either case, according to (6.17) and the definition of (E'_1, F'_1), w_1 is a summand of $p + s$. Since $B_1(1,2) = B_0(1,2) + w_1 - w_0$, if $w_1 \neq w_0$ then

w_1 must be a summand of $p+s-w_0$, and we may construct a positive equivalence $(E_2', F_2') : B_1 \to B_2$ as before, with w_1 in place of w and $B_2(1,2) = B_1(1,2) + w_2 - w_0$. Since $p+s$ is finite, this process must stop at some $w_m = w_0$, and we set $(E', F') = (E_m' \cdots E_1', F_1' \cdots F_m')$. Because $B_m = B_0$, we have by composition a positive equivalence

$$(E', F') : B \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(E,F)}} B_0 \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(E',F')}} B_0 \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(E^{-1},F^{-1})}} B \ .$$

The equivalence $B \xrightarrow{(E,F)} B_0 \xrightarrow{(E',F')} B_0$ is extendable because the matrices E_t, F_t, E_t', F_t' are nonnegative. Extendability through the remaining basic equivalences holds because

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(E_t^{-1} \cdots E_1^{-1} E' E,\ F F' F_1^{-1} \cdots F_t^{-1}\right) \\ = &\left(E' E_t^{-1} \cdots E_1^{-1} E,\ F F_1^{-1} \cdots F_t^{-1} F'\right) \\ = &\left(E' E_{t+1} \cdots E_{i+j},\ F_{t+1} \cdots F_{i+j} F'\right) \end{aligned}$$

and all the matrices in the last line are nonnegative. The equivalence $(U(E')^{-1}, (F')^{-1}V) : B \to B$ is extendable by the induction hypothesis. This finishes the inductive step for Case 2(ii).

Case 3 $i \in \mathcal{C}, j \notin \mathcal{C}$**:**
Proceeding as in Case 1, without loss of generality, we can assume $U = I$. If $r \neq r'$, the inductive step is completed just as in Case 2(i). So suppose $r = r'$. The argument goes as in Case 2(ii), except that the equivalence (E, F) has an easier definition. If w_0 is a summand of s, then to prepare for the application of $(I, E(w_0))$ we may simply apply $(E, F) = (E(w_0), I)$, which gives a positive equivalence because the identity is a summand of v.

Case 4 $i \notin \mathcal{C}, j \in \mathcal{C}$**:**
The proof here is essentially as for Case 3.

□

Lemma 6.18. *Suppose U and V are matrices in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, B and B' are in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, and $UBV = B'$. Then $(U, V) : B \underset{+}{\to} B'$.*

Proof. Recalling Definition 6.10, let $(i_1, j_1), \ldots, (i_r, j_r)$ be an enumeration of elements of $\mathcal{S}$ such that $t \leq s \implies \rho(i_t, j_t) \leq \rho(i_s, j_s)$.

We will define various matrices by induction, beginning with $B_0 = B, B_0' = B', U_0 = U, V_0 = V$. For $1 \leq s \leq r$, given $B_{s-1}, B_{s-1}', U_{s-1}, V_{s-1}$ with $B_{s-1}, B_{s-1}' \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $U_{s-1}, V_{s-1} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, we choose matrices P_s, Q_s in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, equal to I outside block $\{i_s, j_s\}$, such that the following Positivity Conditions hold:

(1) For some nonnegative integer M_s, every entry of $P_s\{i_s, j_s\}$ and every entry of $Q_s\{i_s, j_s\}$ equals $M\delta_i\delta_{ij}\delta_j$.
(2) The blocks $(P_s U_{s-1})\{i_s, j_s\}$ and $(V_{s-1} Q_s)\{i_s, j_s\}$ have all entries in $\mathbb{Z}_+ H_{ij}$.

We note that by taking M_s large in (1), we can achieve (2). We then define matrices W_s, X_s in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, equal to I outside block $\{i_s, j_s\}$, by setting

$$W_s\{i_s, j_s\} = (P_s U_{s-1})\{i_s, j_s\}$$
$$X_s\{i_s, j_s\} = (V_{s-1} Q_s)\{i_s, j_s\} \ .$$

Finally we define

$$U_s = P_s U_{s-1} W_s^{-1} \qquad B_s = W_s B_{s-1} X_s$$
$$V_s = X_s^{-1} V_{s-1} Q_s \qquad B'_s = P_s B'_{s-1} Q_s$$

Then $U_s, V_s \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $B_s, B'_s \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, $0 \le s \le r$.

For $1 \le s \le r$, we will verify the following claims by induction.

(a) $U_s B_s V_s = B'_s$

(b) $B'_{s-1} \xrightarrow[+]{(P_s, Q_s)} B'_s$

(c) $B_{s-1} \xrightarrow[+]{(W_s, X_s)} B_s$

(d) $U_s = P_s \cdots P_1 U W_1^{-1} \cdots W_s^{-1}$ and
$V_s = X_s^{-1} \cdots X_1^{-1} V Q_1 \cdots Q_s$

(e) $U_s\{i_t, j_t\} = 0 = V_s\{i_t, j_t\}$ if $1 \le t \le s$.

Before proving (a)-(e), suppose all these claims hold. Define $P = P_r P_{r-1} \cdots P_1$ and $Q = Q_1 Q_2 \cdots Q_r$. From (b), we have

$$B' = B'_0 \xrightarrow[+]{(P_1, Q_1)} B'_1 \xrightarrow[+]{(P_2, Q_2)} B'_2 \cdots \xrightarrow[+]{(P_r, Q_r)} B'_r = PB'Q$$

and therefore $B' \xrightarrow[+]{(P,Q)} PB'Q$. Similarly, let $W = W_r \cdots W_1$ and $X = X_1 \cdots X_r$. From (c) we have

$$B = B_0 \xrightarrow[+]{(W_1, X_1)} B_1 \xrightarrow[+]{(W_2, X_2)} B_2 \cdots \xrightarrow[+]{(W_r, X_r)} B_r = WBX$$

and therefore $B \xrightarrow[+]{(W,X)} WBX$. Because $\{U_r, V_r\} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, from (e) with $s = r$ we get $U_r = I = V_r$. Using (d) at $s = r$, we then get

$$I \ = \ U_r \ = P_r \cdots P_1 U W_1^{-1} \cdots W_r^{-1} \ = \ PUW^{-1}$$

and similarly $I = V_r = X^{-1} V Q$. Therefore $(PU, VQ) = (W, X)$ and

$$B \xrightarrow[+]{(PU, VQ)} PUBVQ = B'Q \xrightarrow[+]{(P^{-1}U, VQ^{-1})} B' \ .$$

This shows $(U, V) : B \to B'$ is a positive equivalence.

To finish the proof it remains to verify (a)-(e) for $1 \le s \le r$.

Proof of (a). We have $U_0B_0V_0 = B'_0$. Suppose $0 < s \le r$ and (a) holds at $s-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} U_sB_sV_s &= \Big(P_sU_{s-1}W_s^{-1}\Big)\Big(W_sB_{s-1}X_s\Big)\Big(X_s^{-1}V_{s-1}Q_s\Big) \\ &= P_s\Big(U_{s-1}B_{s-1}V_{s-1}\Big)Q_s \\ &= P_sB'_{s-1}Q_s \;=\; B'_s\ . \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (b). We have $B'_0 = B' \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C},\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$. Suppose $1 \le s < r$ and $B'_{s-1} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C},\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$. It follows from Definition 6.6 that $P_sB'_sQ_s \ge B'_s$. Note that we no not know that every entry of B' is positive, but when it fails to be so it is of the form $g_i - 1$ which will be annihilated by P_s and Q_s since $(g_i-1)\delta_i = 0$ if $i \in \mathcal{C}$, and $\delta_j(g_j-1) = 0$ if $j \in \mathcal{C}$.

Now enumerate the coordinates of the nonzero off-diagonal entries of Q as $(a_1,b_1),\dots,(a_T,b_T)$. For $1 \le t \le T$, let E_t be the basic elementary matrix such that $E_t(a_t,b_t) = Q_s(a_t,b_t)$. Because these entries lie in blocks $\{i_s,j\}$ with $i_s \prec j$, we have $Q_s = \prod_{t=1}^{T} E_t$. This $(I,Q) : B'_s \to B'_sQ$ is a composition of equivalences

$$B'_s := B'_{s,0} \xrightarrow[+]{(I,E_1)} B'_{s,1} \xrightarrow[+]{(I,E_2)} \cdots \xrightarrow[+]{(I,E_T)} B'_{s,T} = B'_sQ_s$$

Because each E_t (and by induction, each $B'_{s,t}$) is nonnegative, it follows from Lemma 6.13 that each (I,E_t) gives a positive equivalence. Thus $B'_s \xrightarrow[+]{(I,Q_s)} B'_sQ_s$, and similarly $B'_sQ_s \xrightarrow[+]{(P_s,I)} PB'_sQ_s$. By composition, $B'_sQ \xrightarrow[+]{(P_s,Q_s)} P_sB'_sQ_s$.

Proof of (c). We have $B_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C},\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$. Now suppose $1 \le s < r$ and $B_{s-1} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C},\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$. The matrices W_s and X_s are in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$, with all entries in $\mathbb{Z}_+G$, and $B_{s-1} \le W_sB_{s-1}X_s := B_s$. Therefore $B_s \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C},\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$. An argument very similar to the proof of claim (b) now shows that $B'_{s-1} \xrightarrow[+]{(W_s,X_s)} B_s$.

Proof of (d). The claim (d) follows by induction from the definitions $U_0 = U$, $V_0 = V$, $U_s = P_sU_{s-1}W_s^{-1}$ and $V_s = X_s^{-1}V_{s-1}Q_s$.

Proof of (e). Suppose $1 \le s \le r$ and (e) holds at $s-1$. (At $s-1=0$, (e) is an empty statement.) We have $U_s = P_sU_{s-1}W_s^{-1}$, with P_s and W_s^{-1} equal to I outside block $\{i_s,j_s\}$. On account of the zero block structure of matrices in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$, we have $U_s = U_{s-1}$ except possibly in blocks $\{i,j\}$ such that $i \preceq i_s$ and $j \preceq j_s$.

At (i_s,j_s), we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_s\{i_s,j_s\} &= \Big((P_sU_{s-1})W_s^{-1}\Big)\{i_s,j_s\} \\ &= (P_sU_{s-1})\{i_s,j_s\} + W_s^{-1}\{i_s,j_s\} \\ &= (P_sU_{s-1})\{i_s,j_s\} - W_s\{i_s,j_s\} \;=\; 0\ . \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose $i \prec i_s$. Then $U_s\{i,j\} = U_{s-1}\{i,j\}$ except possibly in the case $j = j_s$, where

$$U_s\{i,j_s\} - U_{s-1}\{i,j_s\} \;=\; U_{s-1}\{i,i_s\}W_s^{-1}\{i_s,j_s\}\ . \tag{6.19}$$

The right side of (6.19) can be nonzero only if $i \prec i_s \prec j_s = j$. In this case, $\rho(i_s,j_s) < \rho(i,j)$, so (i,j) cannot equal (i_t,j_t) for any t less than s. Thus if $1 \le t < s$, then $U_s\{i_t,j_t\} = U_{s-1}\{i_t,j_t\}$, which is zero by the induction hypothesis.

The analogous argument for the case $j_s \prec j$ finishes the proof. □

We make contact to the case with $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ from the general case using the following lemma in combination with a key result from [11].

Lemma 6.20. *Suppose $i \notin \mathcal{C}$, E is a basic elementary matrix in $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$; $E\{j,k\} = I\{j,k\}$ when $(j,k) \ne (i,i)$; $B, B' \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{H})$; and*

$$(E\{i,i\}, I)\colon B\{i,i\} \underset{+}{\to} B'\{i,i\}\ .$$

Then there exists V in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$ such that

$$(E,V)\colon B \underset{+}{\to} EB'V\ .$$

Similarly, if

$$(I, E\{i,i\})\colon B\{i,i\} \underset{+}{\to} B'\{i,i\}$$

then there exists U in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$ such that

$$(U,E)\colon B \underset{+}{\to} UB'E\ .$$

Proof. We will consider the equivalence (E,I); the other case is similar. Let $E(s,t) = v$ be the nonzero off-diagonal entry of E. E acts on B from the left to add v times row t of B to row s of B. If each block $\{i,\ell\}$ of EB is $H_{i\ell}$-positive (e.g., if $v \ge 0$), then set $V = I$.

Otherwise, pick r an index for a column through the $\{i,i\}$ block. For a positive integer L, let V be the matrix in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$ such that (i) if $i \prec \ell$, then every entry of $V\{i,\ell\}$ equals $L\delta_{i\ell}$ and (ii) in other entries, V agrees with I. Then for (s,q) in block $\{i,\ell\}$,

$$(EBV)(s,q) \ge (EB)(s,q) + (B(s,r) - B(t,r))(L\delta_{i\ell})\ .$$

Because $(EB)\{i,i\}$ is H_i-positive, for sufficiently large L the displayed sum must for each such ℓ be $H_{i\ell}$-positive. Then $B \xrightarrow[+]{(I,V)} BV$ and $EBV \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{C},\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$, so

$$B \xrightarrow[+]{(I,V)} BV \xrightarrow[+]{(E,I)} EBV$$

as required. □

Proof of Theorem 6.2. It follows from Observation 6.8 and Proposition 6.11 that to prove Theorem 6.2 we may assume that $B, B' \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{H})$.

Thus let $(U, V)\colon B \to B'$ be the given $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence, with $B, B' \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}^{++}(\mathcal{H})$. Set $U' = \oplus_i U\{i,i\}$ and $V' = \oplus_i V\{i,i\}$. If $i \in \mathcal{C}$, then $n_i = 1$ and $U\{i,i\} = (1) = V\{i,i\}$. If $i \notin \mathcal{C}$, then by [11, Theorem 6.1] we have that

$$(U\{i,i\}, V\{i,i\})\colon\ B\{i,i\} \to B'\{i,i\}$$

is a positive $\mathbb{Z}H_i$ equivalence through matrices which are H_i-positive. So, there is a string $(E_1, F_1), \ldots, (E_T, F_T)$ of elementary $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalences which accomplishes the elementary positive equivalence decomposition inside the diagonal blocks, such that each E_t and F_t equals the identity outside diagonal blocks $\{i,i\}$ with $i \notin \mathcal{C}$. By Lemma 6.20, we may find $(U_1, V_1), \ldots, (U_t, V_t)$ with each U_s and V_s in $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ such that

$$B \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(U_1,F_1)}} \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(E_1,V_1)}} \cdots \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(U_t,F_t)}} \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(E_t,V_t)}} B^* \ .$$

Let $X = E_t U_t \cdots E_2 U_2 E_1 U_1$. Let $Y = F_1 V_1 F_2 V_2 \cdots F_t V_t$. Then for all i in $\mathcal{P}$, $X\{i,i\} = U\{i,i\}$ and $Y\{i,i\} = V\{i,i\}$, so $UX^{-1} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $Y^{-1}V \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$. It then follows from Lemma 6.18 that

$$B^* \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(UX^{-1}, Y^{-1}V)}} B' \ .$$

Thus $(U, V)\colon B \to B'$ is the composition

$$B \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(X,Y)}} B^* \underset{+}{\xrightarrow{(UX^{-1}, Y^{-1}V)}} B'$$

and therefore $(U, V) : B \underset{+}{\to} B'$. □

7. Conclusion

We begin with the promised proof of Theorem 4.3.

(1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2): This implication follows directly from Theorem 5.2.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1): Suppose (2) holds. It then follows from Theorem 6.2 that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence from $I - A^{<0>}$ to $I - C^{<0>}$. There is therefore a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence from $I - A^{<0>}$ to $I - C^{<0>}$. Since every positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence induces a G-flow equivalence (see Section 2), it follows that $T_{A^{<0>}}$ and $T_{C^{<0>}}$ are G-flow equivalent. Since $T_{A^{<0>}} = T_A$ and $T_{C^{<0>}} = T_C$, we thus have that T_A and T_C are G-flow equivalent. It follows in a similar way from Proposition A.1 and Proposition B.1 that T_B and T_C are G-flow equivalent. Thus, we have that T_A and T_B are G-flow equivalent as wanted. □

Next we describe which equivalence classes of matrices arise in the equivalence classes we use as G-flow equivalence invariants. (The invariance of these classes under stabilization was discussed in Section 2.11.)

Theorem 7.1. *Given G, $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{H}$, and $\mathbf{n}$ with $n_i = 1$ if and only if $i \in \mathcal{C}$, suppose B is a matrix in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. *There is a $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{n}$, with $k_i = 1$ if and only if $i \in \mathcal{C}$, and a matrix A in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{k}, \mathcal{H})$, such that $I - A$ is $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{H})$ to $I - B^{<0>}$, where $B^{<0>}$ is the 0-stabilization of B in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{H})$.*
2. *The following hold:*
 (a) *If $i \in \mathcal{C}$, then the 1×1 ith diagonal block of B has the form $[g]$, with H_i generated by g.*
 (b) *If $i \prec j$, $D \in \mathcal{R}_{ij}$ and $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{C}$ and the 1×1 ij block of B is $\sum_{g \in G} n_g g$, with each n_g in $\mathbb{Z}$, then $\sum_{g \in D} n_g > 0$.*

Moreover, given (2), the matrix A can be chosen from $\mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$, where $m_i = 1$ if $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $m_i = n_i + 1$ otherwise.

Proof. (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1): With $\mathbf{m}$ as defined in the "Moreover" statement, let B' be the stabilization of B in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$. Let $M = B' - I$, with diagonal blocks M_i. It suffices to apply $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalences to M which produce a matrix in $\mathcal{M}^{++}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ (recall Definition 6.6). By [11, Proposition 8.8], for i not in $\mathcal{C}$ the matrix M_i is $\mathrm{El}(\mathbb{Z}H_i)$ equivalent to an H_i-positive matrix, M_i'. After applying a block diagonal $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence, we may assume for $i \notin \mathcal{C}$ that M_i is H_i-positive. For these i, in increasing order: for $i \prec j$, as needed multiply from the right by matrices in $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ zero outside the ij block to put all entries of the ij block of M into $\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{H}_{ij}$, with strictly positive coefficients. Then similarly for j in decreasing order: for $i \prec j$, as needed multiply from the left to achieve this positivity.

At this point, all blocks of M are in form for $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ except perhaps the 1×1 ij blocks with $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{C}$. First, for each $D \in \mathcal{R}_{ij}$: pick an element x from D, and multiply from the left and right by basic elementary matrices, of the form $(g_i x g_j)$ in the ij block, to effect the replacement of $\sum_{g \in D} n_g g$ with $(\sum_{g \in D} n_g)x$, which by (2)(b) is positive. For D not in $\mathcal{R}_{ij}$, the coefficients of $\sum_{g \in D} n_g g$ are made positive by elementary multiplications as in the $(i, j, D) \notin \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$ step in the proof of Proposition 6.11. We will refrain from reentering the details of this step.

(1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2): Suppose (1) holds. Condition (2) holds with A in place of B, because $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{k}, \mathcal{H})$ with $k_i = 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $I - B^{<0>} = U(I - A)V$ be the assumed $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence. For $i \in \mathcal{C}$, letting $A\{i, i\} = (g_i)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(I - B)\{i, i\} = (I - B^{<0>})\{i, i\} &= U\{i, i\}(I - A)\{i, i\}V\{i, i\} \\ &= \big((1)(1 - g_i)(1)\big) \ .\end{aligned}$$

Therefore (2a) holds for B. Given $\{i,j\} \subset \mathcal{C}$, let a,b,u,v denote the entries of the singleton $\{i,j\}$ subblocks of A,B,U,V. For $D \in \mathcal{R}_{ij}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_D\big((1-b)\big) &= \pi_D\big((I-B^{<0>})\{i,j\}\big)\\ &= \pi_D\big(U\{i,i\}(I-A)\{i,i\}V\{i,i\}\big)\\ &= \pi_D\big((1-a)+u(1-g_j)+(1-g_i)v\big)\ .\end{aligned}$$

Clearly $\pi_D(u(1-g_j)) = 0 = \pi_D((1-g_i)v)$, and therefore $\pi_D(1-b) = \pi_D(1-a)$, and therefore (2b) holds for B. □

Remark 7.2. In Theorem 7.1, the $I - B^{<0>}$ is a 1-stabilization of the matrix $L = I - B$. The realization can be stated in terms of 1-stabilizations of a matrix L by replacing "B has the form g" in 2(a) with "L has the form $1-g$", and replacing $\sum_{g\in D} n_g > 0$ with $\sum_{g\in D} n_g < 0$ in 2(b).

Lastly, we prove a finiteness result. Given G an abelian group, $\mathcal{P} = \{1,\dots,N\}$ a poset and $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbb{Z}_+G)$, let A_k be the kth diagonal block of A and let $d(A)$ be the N-tuple $(\det(I-A_1),\dots,\det(I-A_N))$. Up to reordering, $d(A)$ is an invariant of G-flow equivalence of the G-SFT T_A defined by A.

Theorem 7.3. *Let G be a finite abelian group , $\mathcal{P} = \{1,\dots,N\}$ a poset, $\mathcal{H}$ a $(G,\mathcal{P})$ coset structure, and $d = (d_1,\dots,d_N)$ an N-tuple of elements of $\mathbb{Z}G$ which are not zero divisors. Then there are only finitely many $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence classes of matrices in the set $\mathfrak{M}(d) := \{I-A : A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H}), d(A) = d\}$. Consequently there are only finitely many flow equivalence classes of G-SFTs T_A with $d(A) = d$.*

Proof. For A in $\mathfrak{M}(d)$, the set $\mathcal{C}$ of cycle components must be empty, and for each i, the matrix $I - A_i$ is injective and the $\mathbb{Z}H_i$-module $\mathsf{cok}(I-A_i)$ has finite size, determined by $\det(I-A_i)$. We will use some facts from [11, Section 9], which contains more detail. A theorem of Fitting shows that if $I-A$ and $I-B$ are injective matrices over $\mathbb{Z}H_i$ with isomorphic cokernels, then there are m,n such that $(I-A)\oplus I_m$ and $(I-B)\oplus I_n$ are $\mathrm{GL}(\mathbb{Z}H_i)$-equivalent [11, Lemma 9.1]. Because H_i is finite abelian, the group $\mathrm{SK}_1(\mathbb{Z}H_i)$ is finite [20]; then by [11, Corollary 9.9], there are only finitely many $\mathrm{El}(\mathbb{Z}H_i)$ equivalence classes of matrices with determinant the non zero divisor d_i. Given such choices for $1 \le i \le N$, fix A in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$ with diagonal blocks $I-A_i$ in the given $\mathrm{El}(\mathbb{Z}H_i)$ classes.

Suppose $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ with $I-A_i$ and $I-B_i$ are $\mathrm{El}(H_i)$ equivalent for each i. We first claim that $I-B$ is $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalent to a matrix in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n},\mathcal{H})$ with the same diagonal blocks as $I-A$. To show this, for each i let $k(i),\ell(i),m(i)$ be nonnegative integers such that there are U_i, V_i in $\mathrm{El}(m_i,H_i)$ such that

$$(I-A_i)\oplus I_{k(i)} \ = \ U_i\Big((I-B_i)\oplus I_{\ell(i)}\Big)V_i\ .$$

Let $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_N)$ and let A', B' be the stabilizations of A, B in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$. Let $U = U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_N$ and $V = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_N$. Set $I - C = U(I - B')V$. Then $I - C$ and $I - B'$ are $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalent and the ith diagonal block of $(I - C)$ equals $(I - A_i) \oplus I_{k(i)}$. After adding multiples of rows and columns from the $I_{k(i)}$, we may produce a matrix $I - D$, $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalent to $I - B$, such that D is zero outside its principal submatrix (P, say) on the indices used to define A. Now $I - P$ is $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalent to $I - B$ and its diagonal blocks equal those of $I - A$.

To finish, it suffices to show $I - P$ is $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalent to a matrix with bounded entries. The ith diagonal block of $I - P$ is the $n_i \times n_i$ matrix $I - A_i$. Let $\mathcal{R}_i$ be the image of the space of row vectors $(\mathbb{Z}H_i)^{n_i}$ under the map $v \mapsto v(I - A_i)$. Let $\kappa_i \in \mathbb{N}$ be the index of $\mathcal{R}_i$ in $(\mathbb{Z}H_i)^{n_i}$. Then $\mathcal{R}_i$ contains $\kappa_i(\mathbb{Z}H_i)^{n_i}$. In the order $j = 2, 3, \ldots, N$ do the following: for $i \prec j$, as needed, multiply $I - P$ from the left by matrices of $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ which are equal to I outside the ijth block to reduce all $\mathbb{Z}$ coefficients in that block to lie in the interval $[0, \kappa_j)$. This shows $I - P$ is $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalent to one of a bounded set of matrices, as required. □

Appendix A. Cohomology as positive equivalence

The next proposition was proved in [11], with (much) worse control over $\mathbf{m}$, using the positive K-theory polynomial strong shift equivalence equations from [12]. The elementary argument below gives a better bound on $\mathbf{m}$; and for the proof of Theorem 5.2, we use the case where m_i is controlled to be n_i. The identity element of G is denoted e.

Proposition A.1. *Suppose D is an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ such that for each s, $D(s, s) = g_s \in G$. Suppose A is an $n \times n$ matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $B = D^{-1}AD$. Then there is an $m \leq n + 1$ and $m \times m$ stabilizations A', B' of A, B such that there is a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence $(I - A') \to (I - B')$.*

Now suppose in addition that $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and for all i in $\mathcal{P}$ that $g_s \in H_i$ whenever $s \in \mathcal{I}_i$. Then $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, and there are $\mathbf{m}$ and stabilizations A', B' of A, B in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ such that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(I - A') \to (I - B')$. The vector $\mathbf{m}$ can be chosen such that for all $i \in \mathcal{P}$,

(1) $m_i \leq n_i + 1$, and
(2) if $g_s = e$ for all $s \in \mathcal{I}_i$ then $m_i = n_i$.


Proof. In the second case, B will be in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ because $\mathcal{H}$ is a coset structure.

We will describe given s a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence which has the effect of multiplying row s from the left by g_s^{-1} and multiplying column s from the right by g_s. The equivalence will satisfy the stabilization bounds and in the second case be a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence.

Applying such an equivalence for each s proves the proposition. For concreteness, suppose $s = 1$ and $g_1 = g$.


We will describe the equivalence as a finite sequence of the row and column cuts from Section 2. We first consider the special case that $A(1,1) = 0$. The target matrix will be named A'. To lighten the notation (avoiding no technical difficulty), we'll suppose a nonzero entry of A is a single element of G; e.g., $A(s,1) = a$ means an edge from vertex s to vertex 1 is labeled by a, as in the graph I below.

(A.2)



I **II** **III**


Multiplying $I - A$ from the left by $E_{s1}(a)$ effects the row cut of the edge from s to 1 labeled a in I and produces the change I→II. Do this for every edge into 1, producing a graph in which 1 has no incoming edge. Then column cut every edge out of 1; the effect is to remove those edges, as in III, leaving 1 an isolated vertex. Let A'' be the matrix produced from A by these moves. Note that applying this procedure to the matrix A' produces the same matrix A'':




The positive equivalence for $A \to A''$ postcomposed with the inverse of the positive equivalence for $A' \to A''$ gives the required positive equivalence $A \to A'$ for this case.

For the case that $A(1,1) = c \neq 0$, we introduce an additional isolated vertex, named v. (If for some vertex s there is no edge from s to itself, then by applying the move corresponding to I→III in (A.2) we could isolate s and avoid increasing the number of vertices.) The argument again is described by a finite sequence of evolving graphs.

(A.3)



I **II** **III**



Here is a list of the corresponding positive equivalences.

- II→I. Column cut the edge $v \to 1$.
- III→II. Row cut the edge $1 \to v$.
- III→IV. Row cut the edge $v \to 1$.
- IV→V. Row cut all incoming edges to 1.
- V→VI. Column cut all outgoing edges from 1.
- VII→VI. Row cut each outgoing edge from v to a different vertex.

At this point, the move from I to VII in (A.3) has replaced the given matrix A with a matrix A'' which satisfies our conditions, except that the vertex v is playing in A'' the role we require for vertex 1. To remedy this, apply the procedure I→VII above to A'', but with $(s, t, v, 1, e)$ in place of $(s, t, 1, v, g)$. We end up with the required matrix A' , with the additional isolated vertex v (i.e., row v and column v of A' are zero). □

Appendix B. Permutation similarity as positive equivalence

Suppose A is an $n \times n$ matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ and P is an $n \times n$ permutation matrix and $B = P^{-1}AP$. Then A, B are elementary strong shift equivalent over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$, as $B = (P^{-1})(AP)$ and $A = (AP)(P^{-1})$, and therefore A and B are $\mathbb{Z}G$ positive equivalent [12]. In the next proposition we show that we can obtain this positive equivalence through $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrices. We also show that if $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $P \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$, then we get a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - B)$.

Proposition B.1. *Let A, B, P, G be as above. Suppose there is an index s with $A(s,s) = 0$. Then there is a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence from A to B through $n \times n$ matrices. In any case there are stabilizations A', B' of A, B which are positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalent through $(n+1)\times(n+1)$ matrices.*

Now suppose in addition that $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $P \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+)$. Then $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, and there are $\mathbf{m}$ and stabilizations A', B' of A, B in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ such that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U, V) : (I - A') \to (I - B')$. The vector $\mathbf{m}$ can be chosen such that $m_i \le n_i + 1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{P}$. If $P\{i,i\} = I$ where $i \in \mathcal{P}$, then U and V can be chosen such that $U\{i,i\}$ and $V\{i,i\}$ are the identity matrix.

Proof. Assume first that there is an index s with $A(s,s) = 0$. Let t be an index different from s. We will describe a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence which has the effect of permuting s and t. If t_1, t_2 are arbitrary indexes, then we get a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence which has the effect of permuting t_1 and t_2 by first permuting s and t_1, then permuting t_1 and t_2, and then finally permuting t_2 and s. Since every permutation of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is the product of transpositions, it will follow that there is a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence $(I-A) \to (I-B)$. The procedure described in (A.2) shows that there is a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - A_1)$ such that s is an isolated index in $\mathcal{G}_{A_1}$. If also $A(t,t) = 0$, then there is a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence $(I - A_1) \to (I - A_2)$ such that t is an isolated index in $\mathcal{G}_{A_2}$, and if we then postcompose the equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - A_2)$ with its inverse but with the role of s and t interchanged, then we get a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - A_3)$ where A_3 is the matrix obtained from A by permuting s and t. If $A(t,t) \neq 0$, then the procedure described in (A.3) with $g = e$ shows that there is a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence $(I - A_1) \to (I - A'_2)$ where A'_2 is obtained from A_2 by permuting s and t. By postcomposing with the inverse of the equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - A_1)$ but with the role of s and t interchanged, we get a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence $(I - A) \to (I - A'_3)$ where A'_3 is the matrix obtained from A by permuting s and t.

If there is no index $s \in \mathcal{G}_A$ with $A(s,s) = 0$, then we add a zero row and a zero column to A and B to obtain matrices A' and B', and then it follows from the argument above that there is a positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalence $(I - A') \to (I - B')$.

Now suppose in addition that $A \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and $P \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$. Then $P\{i,j\} = 0$ if $i \neq j$. It follows that $B \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$. We let P^*_i denote the matrix in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G)$ such that $P^*_i\{i,i\} = P\{i,i\}$, $P^*_i\{j,j\} = I$ for $j \neq i$, and $P^*_i\{i',j'\} = 0$ for $i' \neq j'$. Then $P = P^*_{i_1} P^*_{i_2} \cdots P^*_{i_N}$. Let $A_1 = (P^*_{i_1})^{-1} A P^*_{i_1}$, $A_2 = (P^*_{i_2})^{-1} A_1 P^*_{i_2}, \dots, A_N = (P^*_{i_N})^{-1} A_{N-1} P^*_{i_N} = B$. It follows from the first half of the proposition that there are stabilizations $A', A'_1, A'_2, \dots, A'_N = B'$ of $A, A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N = B$ and positive $\mathbb{Z}G$ equivalences $(I - A') \to (I - A'_1) \to (I - A'_1) \to (I - A'_2) \to \cdots \to (I - A'_N) = (I - B')$ and that B' can be chosen such

that $B' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ with $m_i \leq n_i+1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{P}$. It is not difficult to check that the described equivalence $(U, V) : (I - A') \to (I - B')$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{H})$ equivalence, and that if $P\{i, i\} = I$ where $i \in \mathcal{P}$, then U and V can be chosen such that $U\{i, i\}$ and $V\{i, i\}$ are the identity matrix. □

Appendix C. Resolving extensions

Proposition C.1. *Suppose A is a matrix in $\mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$ and A' is a matrix obtained from A by splitting a row s into two rows. Let the rows of A' be in the same order as corresponding rows of A, with the interpolation of a new row s' directly following s. Let A' have the natural $\mathcal{P}$ blocking: s' is in the block of s, and every other index is in the block of the row from which it was copied. Let $\widetilde{A}$ be the matrix of size and blocking from $\mathbf{n}'$ obtained by interpolating a zero s' row and column into A.*

Then $\widetilde{A}, A' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$ and there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U, V) : (I - \widetilde{A}) \to (I - A')$. If A is upper triangular and $A(s, s) = A'(s, s)$, then A' is upper triangular and the matrices U, V can be chosen to be unipotent upper triangular.

Moreover, the same conclusion holds if in the above statements "row" is replaced by "column" and "following" is replaced by "preceding".

Proof. Let us first check that $A' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$ (it is obvious that $\widetilde{A} \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$). It is easy to check that $A' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbb{Z}_+G) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}, \mathcal{H})$, so we just need to show that $\mathcal{H}$ is a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure for A'. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure for A, there is a family of vertices $\{v(i)\}_{i\in\mathcal{P}}$ such that $v(i)$ belongs to the irreducible core of $A\{i, i\}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{P}$, and H_{ij} is the set of weights of paths from $v(i)$ to $v(j)$ in $\mathcal{G}_A$. Let $i, j \in \mathcal{P}$. We aim to show that the set of weights of paths from $v(i)$ to $v(j)$ in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ is equal to H_{ij}. Notice that if p is a path in $\mathcal{G}_A$ not starting at s, then there is a path in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ starting and ending at the same vertices as p and with the same weight as p. Notice also that if p is a path in $\mathcal{G}_A$ starting at s, then there is a path in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ starting at either s or s' and ending at the same vertex as p and with the same weight as p. Similarly, if p is a path in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$, then there is a path in $\mathcal{G}_A$ which has the same weight as p and which starts and ends at the same vertices as p (except of course if p starts/ends at s' in which case the path in $\mathcal{G}_A$ starts/ends at s instead). It follows that if $v(i) \neq s$, then the set of weights of paths from $v(i)$ to $v(j)$ in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ is equal to H_{ij}. Suppose that $v(i) = s$ and that p is a path in $\mathcal{G}_A$ starting at s and that there is a path in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ starting at s' and ending at the same vertex as p and with the same weight as p. Suppose that there is a path from s to s' in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ (if there is no path in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$, then there must be a path from s' to s because $s = v(i)$ in the irreducible core of $A\{i, i\}$, and the we just interchange the role of s and s'). Let γ be

the weight of this path. Since the set of weights of paths in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ from s to s is equal to the set of weights of paths in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ from s to s' and is a group (because it is a finite semigroup), it follows that there is a path in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ from s to s with weight γ^{-1}, and thus that there is there is a path in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ starting at s and ending at the same vertex as p and with the same weight as p. It follows that the set of weights of paths from $s = v(i)$ to $v(j)$ in $\mathcal{G}_{A'}$ is equal to H_{ij}. This shows that $\mathcal{H}$ is a $(G, \mathcal{P})$ coset structure for A' and thus that $A' \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$.

We then show that there is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$ equivalence $(U, V) : I - \widetilde{A} \to I - A'$. We write A in a 3×3 block form, giving

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} q & r & t \\ u & v & w \\ x & y & z \end{pmatrix} \qquad \widetilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} q & r & 0 & t \\ u & v & 0 & w \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x & y & 0 & z \end{pmatrix} .$$

(We omit the easier proof for the case that s is a first or last index of A, and the block form is smaller.) The central index set of A is $\{s\}$, so v is the 1×1 matrix $A(s, s)$. The matrix A' then has the block form

$$A' = \begin{pmatrix} q & r & r & t \\ u_1 & v_1 & v_1 & w_1 \\ u_2 & v_2 & v_2 & w_2 \\ x & y & y & z \end{pmatrix}$$

with A' nonnegative and $(u_1, v_1, w_1) + (u_2, v_2, w_2) = (u, v, w)$. We then have a string of positive equivalences:

$$I - \widetilde{A} \to E_1(I - \widetilde{A}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u & 1-v & 0 & -w \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u & 1-v & -1 & -w \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix} := I - A_1 .$$

$$I - A_1 \to (I - A_1)E_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u & 1-v & -1 & -w \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -u_2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u_1 & 1-v & -1 & -w \\ -u_2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix} := I - A_2$$

$$I - A_2 \to (I - A_2)E_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u_1 & 1-v & -1 & -w \\ -u_2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -v_2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u_1 & 1-v_1 & -1 & -w \\ -u_2 & -v_2 & 1 & 0 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix} := I - A_3$$

$$I - A_3 \to (I - A_3)E_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u_1 & 1-v_1 & -1 & -w \\ -u_2 & -v_2 & 1 & 0 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -w_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u_1 & 1-v_1 & -1 & -w_1 \\ -u_2 & -v_2 & 1 & -w_2 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix} := I - A_4$$

$$(I - A_4) \to (I - A_4)E_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & 0 & -t \\ -u_1 & 1-v_1 & -1 & -w_1 \\ -u_2 & -v_2 & 1 & -w_2 \\ -x & -y & 0 & 1-z \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1-q & -r & -r & -t \\ -u_1 & 1-v_1 & -v_1 & -w_1 \\ -u_2 & -v_2 & 1-v_2 & -w_2 \\ -x & -y & -y & 1-z \end{pmatrix} = I - A' \ .$$

This exhibits the equivalence $(U, V) : I - \widetilde{A} \to I - A'$, with $U = E_1$ and $V = E_2E_3E_4E_5$. It is clear that $E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4, E_5 \in \mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$, and it is not difficult to check that $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 \in \mathcal{M}^o_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$. It follows that $(U, V) : I - \widetilde{A} \to I - A'$ is a positive $\mathrm{El}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{n}', \mathcal{H})$ equivalence.

In general the matrices U, V will not be upper triangular, because in general E_2 and E_3 are not upper triangular. However, if A is upper triangular, then $u = 0$, so $u_1 = u_2 = 0$; and if $A'(s, s) = A(s, s)$, then $v_1 = v$, so $v_2 = v - v_1 = 0$. Thus under the additional assumptions, A' is upper triangular and the matrices $U = E_1$ and $V = E_2E_3E_4E_5$ are unipotent upper triangular as required.

The argument for the "Moreover" claim is essentially the same, and we omit it. □

Appendix D. G-SFTs following Adler-Kitchens-Marcus

The purpose of this appendix is to relate some invariants from our matrix framework to the more geometric group actions framework of

Adler-Kitchens-Marcus [2, 1]. We will also end with some remarks on topological conjugacy of irreducible G-SFTs which indicate some of the difficulty we avoid in our flow equivalence analysis by being able to reduce to the case of G-primitive diagonal components. This appendix is not necessary for the statements or proofs of the flow equivalence results of earlier sections. Throughout, G is a finite group.

Our first aim is Theorem D.1, following Adler, Kitchens and Marcus [2, 1]. Theorem D.1 explains how to reduce the classification of nonwandering G-SFTs to the classification of irreducible K-SFTs, for normal subgroups K of G.

An SFT is *nonwandering* if it has no wandering orbit; equivalently, it is the disjoint union of finitely many irreducible SFTs (its *irreducible components*). A nonwandering/irreducible/mixing G-SFT is a G-SFT (Y, T) which as an SFT is nonwandering/irreducible/mixing. A nonwandering G-SFT was defined to be G-*transitive* [1, Section 4] if the G action on irreducible components is transitive. Clearly a nonwandering G-SFT is G-transitive if and only if the canonical factor map collapsing G-orbits maps each irreducible component onto the same irreducible SFT. If C is an irreducible component of Y of period p, then let $C^0, \ldots, C^{p-1}$ denote cyclically moving subsets of C: the C^i are disjoint; T maps C^i onto C^{i+1} (subscripts interpreted mod p); and for each i, the restriction of T^p to C^i is a mixing SFT.

Let G be a finite group and let (Y, T) be a nonwandering G-transitive G-SFT. We take this left G-SFT (Y, T) to be $Y = X \times G$ with $T : (x, g) \to (\sigma x, g\tau(x))$ with $\tau : X \to G$ continuous, and left G action by $g : (x, h) \to (x, gh)$, as in Section 2 (recall our Standing Convention 2.3.1; in contrast, the G-SFTs of [2, 1] are right G-SFTs). Let C be an irreducible component of Y, with cyclically moving subsets $C^0, \ldots, C^{p-1}$. For $g \in G$, let $gC := \{(x, gh) : (x, h) \in C\}$. Then gC is an irreducible component of Y. The map $(x, h) \mapsto (x, gh)$ sending C to gC is a topological conjugacy of SFTs (but not of G-SFTs, when G is not abelian). The *stabilizer* of C is the subgroup $H_C = H = \{g \in G : gC = C\}$. For $g \in G$, we have $H_{gC} = gH_Cg^{-1}$. Let $H^i_C = H^i = \{g \in G : gC^0 = C^i\} = \{g \in H : gC^0 = C^i\}$. If $p > 1$, then for $1 \le i \le p-1$ the set H^i is a left coset of H^0 in H (and also a right coset of H^0 in H, because H^0 is normal in H), and H is the disjoint union of the cosets H^i, $0 \le i \le p-1$. Let g_C be in H^1, i.e. $g_CH^0 = H^1$. Note, $g_C^{-1}H^0g_C = H^0$: i.e., g_C is in $\mathcal{N}(H)$, the normalizer of H^0 in G. Therefore $g^i_CH^0 = H^i$. If $p = 1$, then the G-SFT is mixing; in this case H^1 is H^0.

We call the subgroup H^0 of H the *primitive stabilizer* of C. We call H^1 the *stabilizer coset* ("primitive stabilizer coset" would be more accurate, but lengthier). Subsets E, E' of G are *conjugate in* G if there exists g in G such that $E' = gEg^{-1}$. If H^1 and $(H')^1$ are stabilizer cosets for two nonwandering G-SFTs with the same period, and

$(H')^1 = gH^1g^{-1}$, then $(H')^0 = gH^0g^{-1}$ and $H' = gHg^{-1}$: a conjugacy of stabilizer cosets produces a conjugacy of primitive stabilizers and stabilizer.

Theorem D.1. *Suppose G is a finite group and (Y,T) and (Y',T') are nonwandering G-transitive G-SFTs, containing irreducible components C, C' (resp.) with $C^i, (C')^i, H^i, (H')^i$, etc., as defined above. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) (Y,T) and (Y',T') are G-conjugate.
(2) There exists g in G such that the following hold:
 (a) $H^1_{C'} = gH^1_C g^{-1}$ (i.e. g conjugates the stabilizer cosets).
 (b) The irreducible H-SFTs gC and C' are H-conjugate.

Remark D.2. We will sketch a proof below for Theorem D.1, because it is not stated explicitly in [1, Section 4], although all the ideas are there (adapted from Rudolph's ergodic-theoretic work [25]). Adler-Kitchens-Marcus are not responsible for the terms "primitive stabilizer" and "stabilizer coset".

Proof of Theorem D.1. (1) $\implies$ (2): A G-conjugacy $(Y,T) \to (Y',T')$ will restrict to an H_C-conjugacy from the irreducible component C of Y to some irreducible component D of Y'; it follows that $(H^0_C, H^1_C) = (H^0_D, H^1_D)$. By the G-transitivity, there is some $g \in G$ such that $D = gC'$, and therefore

$$H^1_{C'} = g^{-1}H^1_D g = g^{-1}H^1_C g.$$

(2) $\implies$ (1): In (2), after replacing C with gC we may assume that C and C' have the same stabilizer invariants H, H^0, H^1, and there is an H-conjugacy $C \to C'$. This conjugacy has the form $(x,g) \mapsto (\varphi(x), g\gamma(x))$, where $\gamma : X \to G$ is continuous and satisfies the coboundary equation $\tau(x) = [\gamma(x)]^{-1}\tau'(x)\gamma(\sigma x)$ for all x in C. For each irreducible component D of $X \times G$, pick g_D in G such that $g_D C = D$. Pick $g_C = e$. Extend this map to all of $X \times G$ as follows: for (x,g) in C, $(x, g_d g) \mapsto (\varphi(x), g_d g\gamma(x))$. This gives a well defined homeomorphism $X \times G \to X' \times G$ which intertwines the left G-actions. Because the coboundary equation holds for all (x,g) in C, the map also defines a topological conjugacy of the SFTs T and T'. □

We now turn to relating matrix properties to the Adler-Kitchens-Marcus setting. Let A be a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ with amalgamation $\overline{A}$ over $\mathbb{Z}_+$ as in Section 2. Let $a_{ij} = A(i,j)$ and define nonnegative integers a_{ijkg} by $A^k(i,j) = \sum_{g\in G} a_{ijkg}g$; let a_{ijg} denote a_{ij1g}.

We recall some terminology. A is irreducible/primitive if $\overline{A}$ is irreducible/primitive. A is nondegenerate if it has no zero row and no zero column. The nondegenerate core of A is its maximum nondegenerate principal submatrix. For a property P, A is essentially P if its nondegenerate core is P. A is G-primitive if there exists $k > 0$ such

that $a_{ijkg} > 0$ for all i, j, g. Equivalently (by [9, Theorem B.5] and Proposition D.7(1) below), A is G-primitive if and only if the following hold:

(1) A is irreducible;
(2) G is the stabilizer group of some (hence every) irreducible component of T_A;
(3) $\gcd\{k > 0 : \sum_i a_{iike} > 0\} = 1$.

A is G-irreducible if there exists $p > 0$ such that A^p is a direct sum of p G-primitive principal submatrices. We omit a proof of the next proposition (part (3) is easy and part (2) follows easily from part (1).)

Proposition D.3. *Let G be a finite group and A a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$, defining a G-SFT T_A as in Section 2. The following hold.*

(1) A is essentially G-primitive $\iff$ T_A is mixing. (This is [9, Cor. B.7]*.)*
(2) A is essentially G-irreducible $\iff$ T_A is irreducible.
(3) A is essentially irreducible $\iff$ T_A is G-transitive and non-wandering.

Definition D.4. Let A be a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. For an index i of A, the *weights group* (at i) is

$$W_i(A) = \{g \in G : \exists k > 0 \text{ such that } a_{iikg} > 0\}$$

and the *ratio group* (at i) is

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_i(A) &= \{gh^{-1} : \exists k \text{ such that } a_{ijkg} > 0 \text{ and } a_{ijkh} > 0\} \\ &= \{gh^{-1} : \exists k \text{ such that } a_{iikg} > 0 \text{ and } a_{iikh} > 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

$W_i(A)$ is clearly a finite semigroup, and hence a group. We will see below that $\Delta_i(A)$ is a group. It is named after a "ratio group" which plays an analogous role in the theory of Markov shifts [19, 23].

Our next task is to compute the stabilizer data for T_A from the matrix A. First we recall a standard reduction; see the citation for a proof.

Proposition D.5. [11, Proposition 4.4] *Let A be an irreducible matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. Let i be an index of A and let $H = W_i(A)$. Then there is a diagonal matrix D over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$ with each diagonal entry in G (i.e. $\overline{D} = I$) such that every entry of DAD^{-1} lies in $\mathbb{Z}_+H$.*

An important technical point for proofs below is the following observation.

Remark D.6. Suppose A is a square matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$, $(w, g), (x, h) \in X_{\overline{A}} \times G$, $g = h$, and the initial vertices of x_0 and w_0 are equal. Then (w, g) and (x, h) are in the same cyclically moving subset of the same irreducible component of $X_{\overline{A}} \times G$.

Proposition D.7. *Let A be an irreducible matrix over $\mathbb{Z}_+G$. Let x be a point in $X_{\overline{A}}$ with x_0 beginning at index i. Let C be an irreducible component of T_A containing (x, e) and choose $C^0, \ldots, C^{p-1}$ such that $(x, e) \in C^0$. Then the following hold.*

1. *The stabilizer H_C is the weights group $W_i(A)$.*
2. *The matrix $B = DAD^{-1}$ over $\mathbb{Z}_+H$ from Theorem D.5 defines an irreducible H-SFT T_B which is G-cohomologous to the H-SFT C.*
3. *The primitive stabilizer H_C^0 is the ratio group $\Delta_i(A)$.*
4. *For any g, j such that $a_{ijg} > 0$, the stabilizer coset H_C^1 equals $g\Delta_i(A)$.*

Proof. (1): Suppose $g \in H_C$; then $(x, g) \in C$. By irreducibility of C, there must then be some path $z_0 \ldots z_{k-1}$ in $X_{\overline{A}}$ from i to i with weight g. Therefore $g \in W_i(A)$.

Conversely, suppose $g \in W_i(A)$. Then there is $k > 0$ and a periodic point x in $X_{\overline{A}}$ with $\ell(x_0)\ell(x_1)\cdots\ell(x_{k-1}) = g$ (here $\ell(x_n)$ denotes the label of the edge x_n in $\mathcal{G}_A$, see Section 2) such that i equals the initial vertex of x_0 and the terminal vertex of x_{k-1}. The point (x, e) must be in C. Therefore $(x, g) \in C$. Thus $gC \cap C \neq \emptyset$, so $gC = C$ and $g \in H_C$.

(2): The diagonal matrix D gives the G-cohomology. T_B is irreducible because C is irreducible.

(3): Given g, h, k as in the definition of $\Delta_i(A)$, using Remark D.6 one can see g and h are in H_C^k, and therefore $gh^{-1} \in H_C^0$. Conversely, suppose $g \in H_C^0$. Then g there is $k > 0$ and a path $x_0 \cdots x_{kp-1}$ from i to i with weight g. Then for arbitrarily large $j > 0$ there is a path (by concatenations) of length jp from i to i with weight g. For sufficiently large j, there is also a path of length jp from i to i with weight e.

(4): Clear. □

Remark D.8. Given an H-irreducible matrix A with period $p > 1$ and stabilizer coset cH_0, define $B = c^{-1}A$. Then T_B is a mixing H_0-SFT. If A is another H-irreducible matrix with the same period and the same stabilizer coset cH_0, and $B' = c^{-1}A'$, then it is not difficult to check (as in the analogous Markov measure setting of [19, 23]) that the following are equivalent:

1. The irreducible H-SFTs T_A and $T_{A'}$ are topologically conjugate H-SFTs.
2. The mixing H_0-SFTs T_B and $T_{B'}$ are topologically conjugate H_0-SFTs.

Now suppose H is not abelian. One naturally considers $S : C^0 \to C^0$ defined by the rule $S : x \mapsto c^{-1}T_A(x)$. This S does not commute with a left H_0 action or with a right H_0 action. S is a $\mathbb{Z} \otimes_\alpha H_0$ action in the sense of Adler-Kitchens-Marcus [2], with $\alpha : h \mapsto c^{-1}gc$. If S' is defined in the same way from $T_{A'}$, then one can check the following are equivalent:

(1) The irreducible H-SFTs T_A and $T_{A'}$ are topologically conjugate H-SFTs.
(2) S and S' are topologically conjugate as $\mathbb{Z} \otimes_\alpha H$ actions.

However, we do not know how how to classify these skew actions without going back to the original irreducible H-SFTs.

References

[1] R. Adler, B. Kitchens, and B. Marcus. Almost topological classification of finite-to-one factor maps between shifts of finite type. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 5(4):485–500, 1985.

[2] R. L. Adler, B. Kitchens, and B. H. Marcus. Finite group actions on shifts of finite type. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 5(1):1–25, 1985.

[3] S. E. Arklint, G. Restorff, and E. Ruiz. Classification of real rank zero, purely infinite C^*-algebras with at most four primitive ideals. arXiv:1405.0672, 2014.

[4] M. Boyle. Flow equivalence of shifts of finite type via positive factorizations. *Pacific J. Math.*, 204(2):273–317, 2002.

[5] M. Boyle. Positive K-theory and symbolic dynamics. In *Dynamics and randomness (Santiago, 2000)*, volume 7 of *Nonlinear Phenom. Complex Systems*, pages 31–52. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2002.

[6] M. Boyle, T. M. Carlsen, and S. Eilers. Flow equivalence and isotopy for subshifts. arXiv:1511.03478, 2015.

[7] M. Boyle, T. M. Carlsen, and S. Eilers. Flow equivalence of sofic shifts. arXiv:1511.03481, 2015.

[8] M. Boyle and D. Huang. Poset block equivalence of integral matrices. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(10):3861–3886 (electronic), 2003.

[9] M. Boyle and S. Schmieding. Finite group extensions of shifts of finite type: K-theory, Parry and Livšic. arXiv:1503.02050, to appear in *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 2015.

[10] M. Boyle and B. Steinberg. Decidability of matrix equivalence and diagram isomorphism, for Cuntz-Krieger C^*-algebras and flow equivalence (working title). In preparation, 2015.

[11] M. Boyle and M.C. Sullivan. Equivariant flow equivalence for shifts of finite type, by matrix equivalence over group rings. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 91(1):184–214, 2005.

[12] M. Boyle and J. B. Wagoner. Positive algebraic K-theory and shifts of finite type. In *Modern dynamical systems and applications*, pages 45–66. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[13] M. Field. Equivariant diffeomorphisms hyperbolic transverse to a G-action. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 27(3):563–576, 1983.

[14] M. Field and M. Golubitsky. *Symmetry in chaos*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, second edition, 2009. A search for pattern in mathematics, art, and nature.

[15] M. Field and M. Nicol. Ergodic theory of equivariant diffeomorphisms: Markov partitions and stable ergodicity. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 169(803):viii+100, 2004.

[16] D. Huang. Flow equivalence of reducible shifts of finite type. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 14(4):695–720, 1994.

[17] B.P. Kitchens. *Symbolic dynamics; One-sided, two-sided and countable state Markov shifts*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[18] D. Lind and B. Marcus. *An introduction to symbolic dynamics and coding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[19] B. Marcus and S. Tuncel. The weight-per-symbol polytope and scaffolds of invariants associated with Markov chains. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 11(1):129–180, 1991.
[20] R. Oliver. *Whitehead groups of finite groups*, volume 132 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
[21] W. Parry. Notes on coding problems for finite state processes. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 23(1):1–33, 1991.
[22] W. Parry. The Livšic periodic point theorem for non-abelian cocycles. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19(3):687–701, 1999.
[23] W. Parry and K. Schmidt. Natural coefficients and invariants for Markov-shifts. *Invent. Math.*, 76(1):15–32, 1984.
[24] W. Parry and D. Sullivan. A topological invariant of flows on 1-dimensional spaces. *Topology*, 14(4):297–299, 1975.
[25] D.J. Rudolph. Counting the relatively finite factors of a Bernoulli shift. *Israel J. Math.*, 30(3):255–263, 1978.
[26] K. Schmidt. Remarks on Livšic' theory for nonabelian cocycles. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19(3):703–721, 1999.

Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4015, USA
E-mail address: mmb@math.umd.edu

Department of Science and Technology, University of the Faroe Islands, Nóatún 3, FO-100 Tórshavn, The Faroe Islands
E-mail address: toke.carlsen@gmail.com

Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark
E-mail address: eilers@math.ku.dk